arXiv:math/0510326v1 [math.AP] 16 Oct 2005

Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients.
III. Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field

Victor Ivrii*[†][‡]

November 5, 2004

Abstract

This paper is a continuation of [BrIvr] and [Ivr5].

Now I start analysis of the Schrödinger operator with the strong magnetic field. Keeping in mind the crucial role played by the microlocal canonical form in Chapter 6 of [Ivr1], devoted to such operators in the smooth case, the lack of the ultimate smoothness here seems to be the catastrophic because complete microlocal canonical form requires such smoothness. However, combining ideas of section 6 of [Ivr1] and [BrIvr] with an idea of the incomplete reduction, with a remainder which is just small enough for our needs, I manage under very moderate smoothness conditions to derive sharp remainder estimates: namely, under non-degeneracy condition $\nabla(V/F)\neq 0$, assuming a bit more than C^1 and C^2 for $d=3$ and $d=2$ respectively 1), I recover remainder estimates $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1})$ and $O(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+1)$ respectively exactly as in the smooth case. Further, for $d=3$ without this non-degeneracy condition I recover remainder estimate $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}})$ in C^l-case, $1\le l\le 2$. Here $h\ll 1$ and $\mu\gg 1$ are Planck and coupling constants respectively.

---

[*] Work was partially supported by NSERC grant OGP0138277.

[†] Work was partially supported by Canada Council for the Arts via Killam Program.

[‡] Important parts of the research were done in July 2002 when the author was visiting Université Paris-Nord.

1) Actually, the metrics and the magnetic field should belong to C^4 as $d=2$ and $\mu\gg h^{-1}$.

0 Introduction

0.1 Preliminary

This paper is a continuation of [BrIvr] and [Ivr5] and a part of the project to derive sharp remainder estimates for various classes of irregular operators (i.e. operators with irregular coefficients and in irregular domains).

Here we start analysis of the Schrödinger operator with the strong magnetic field (or, equivalently, a large coupling constant μ).

Keeping in mind the crucial role played by the microlocal canonical form in Chapter 6 of [Ivr1], devoted to such operators in the smooth case, the lack of the ultimate smoothness here seems to be the catastrophic[2)] because complete microlocal canonical form requires such smoothness. Instead, in this paper I will make a partial reduction with a remainder which is just small enough for our needs but not excessively small, and such reduction requires much lesser smoothness.

This reduction serves two purposes.

First, if magnetic field is not very strong $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ [3)], I will use it only to prove that singularities leave the diagonal and propagate away from it and thus the time interval for which we have the standard decomposition of the propagator trace could be extended from $\{|t| \le T_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}\}$ [4)] to a larger one thus improving remainder estimate $O(\mu h^{1-d})$ which is due to rescaling as well.

Namely, for $d = 2$ I use non-degeneracy condition $|\nabla(V/F)| \ne 0$ and extend time to $\{|t| \le T_1 = \epsilon\mu\}$ thus improving estimate to $O(\mu^{-1}h^{-1})$. For $d = 3$ no non-degeneracy condition at this stage is needed: I consider zone $\{|\xi_3| \ge C\mu^{-1}\}$ where ξ_3 is a velocity along magnetic field and I use this movement to prove that singularities leave the diagonal, increasing time interval to $\{|t| \le \epsilon|\xi_3|\}$ [5)] and another zone $\{|\xi_3| \le C\mu^{-1}\}$ which is small enough to estimate it contribution to the remainder by $O(h^{-2})$.

On the other hand, if magnetic field is strong enough, I use this canonical form to derive spectral asymptotics as well. For $d = 3$ and $\mu h \le 1$ I do this only in the inner zone $\{|\xi_3| \le C\sqrt{\mu h}\}$, treating external zone $\{|\xi_3| \ge C\sqrt{\mu h}\}$ in the same way as before. Only at this stage qualified estimate of the remainder in canonical form is needed.

Combining this idea of this “poor man canonical form” with the ideas of section 6 of [Ivr1], and [BrIvr], I manage to derive sharp spectral asymptotics under very moderate smoothness conditions: namely, under non-degeneracy condition $\nabla(V/F) \ne 0$, assuming

---

[2)] In [Ivr2, Ivr3] the irregularities were rare enough in the domain of the really strong field.

[3)] I skip factors $|\log h|^\beta$ in this preliminary part.

[4)] The result which is just a rescaling of the standard theory (i.e. the theory with $\mu = 1$).

[5)] Actually, a bit better but I skip logarithmic factors here.

$C^{1,2}$- and $C^{2,1}$-regularity for $d=3$ and $d=2$ respectively, I recover remainder estimates $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1})$ and $O(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+1)$ respectively exactly as in the smooth case; for $d=3$ without this non-degeneracy condition I recover remainder estimate $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}})$ in $C^{l,\sigma}$-case, $1\le l\le 2$ with appropriate σ.

Actually, to recover remainder estimate $O(1)$ for $d=2$ and $\mu\gg h^{-1}$ I need to assume that the metrics and the magnetic field should belong to C^4.

Here and below $C^{l,\sigma}$ denotes a space of functions which $\lfloor l\rfloor$-derivatives are continuous with the continuity modulus $|x-y|^{l-\lfloor l\rfloor}\bigl|\log|x-y|\bigr|^{-\sigma}$ if $l\notin\mathbb{N}$ or $l\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma>0$; for $l\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma\le 0$ one should take $l-1$ instead of $\lfloor l\rfloor$; σ will be positive and large enough in most of the statements[6)].

In this paper I consider $d=2$ and $d=3$ only. For $d\ge 4$ the sharp remainder estimate was not derived even in the smooth case due to lack of the canonical form[7)]. However, in some of the next articles I will to cover multidimensional case as well, using the idea of the partial canonical form of this work. However, a higher smoothness will be required.

I consider Schrödinger operator in the strong magnetic field

$$A=A_0+V(x),\qquad A_0=\sum_{j,k\le d}P_jg^{jk}(x)P_k, \tag{0.1}$$
$$P_j=hD_j-\mu V_j(x),\quad \mu\ge 1$$

with real symmetric positive matrix (g^{jk}), real-valued V_j, V and small parameter h and large parameter μ.

I assume that the corresponding *magnetic field intensity* $F^l(x)=\frac12\sum_{jk}\upsilon^{jkl}(\partial_{x_j}V_k-\partial_{x_k}V_j)$ with the standard absolutely skew-symmetric tensor υ^{jkl} [8)] does not vanish in domain in question. Note that for $d=2$ automatically $F^1=F^2=0$ and thus magnetic field is reduced to F^3.

For $d=3$ we can straighten vector field $\mathbf{F}=(F^1,F^2,F^3)$ and direct it along x_3 by an appropriate choice of variables x_1,x_2 [9)] and make $V_3=0$ by an appropriate *gauge transformation* $A\mapsto e^{-i\mu h^{-1}\Phi(x)}Ae^{i\mu h^{-1}\Phi}$. *I assume that this is has been done and impose smoothness conditions to the reduced operator*.

Thus I assume that for this reduced operator

$$V_3=0,\qquad \partial_{x_3}V_k=0\quad k=1,2 \tag{0.2}$$

[6)] In contrast to [BrIvr] and [Ivr5] I am not obsessed here to decrease σ but I am still pushing hard l down.

[7)] Because of variable multiplicities of the eigenvalues of the matrix magnetic intensity and their "high-order resonances" when one of their linear combination with integer coefficients vanishes.

[8)] With non-zero components equal $\pm g^{\frac12}$ where here and in what follows $g=\det(g^{jk})$ and $(g_{jk})=(g^{jk})^{-1}$.

[9)] To be consistent one should write rather x^1,x^2.

where the second condition is due to the first one and assumption $F^1 = F^2 = 0$; then one can reduce it further to $V_2 = 0$ and then

$$\mathbf{F} = (0, 0, F^3), \quad F^3 = g^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial_{x_1} V_2 - \partial_{x_2} V_1), \quad g = \det(g^{jk})^{-1} \tag{0.3}$$

and the scalar intensity of magnetic field is

$$F = g_{33}^{\frac{1}{2}} |F^3| = (g^{11}g^{22} - g^{12}g^{21})^{\frac{1}{2}} |(\partial_{x_1} V_2 - \partial_{x_2} V_1)|, \quad (g_{jk}) = (g^{jk})^{-1}. \tag{0.4}$$

In particular for $d = 2$ one can assume that $g^{33} = 1$, $g^{3j} = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$; without taking absolute value we get *pseudo-scalar intensity* then.

Further, I assume that

$$F \geq c^{-1} \tag{0.5}$$

Multiplying operator by $F^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from both sides one can further reduce to the case

$$F = 1; \tag*{(0.5)*}$$

then operator will be $\sum_{j,k} P_j F^{-1} g^{jk} P_k + F^{-1}(V - h^2 V_1)$ with $V_1 = F^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j,k} \partial_j \bigl(g^{jk} \partial_k F^{-\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)$ and this perturbation will not affect our results unless $d = 2$, $\mu \geq h^{-1}$ (in which case V should be corrected).

0.2 Smooth case. Survey

It is known (see Chapter 6, [Ivr1]) that for $d = 2$ in the smooth case one can reduce operator further to microlocal canonical form

$$\mu^2 \sum_{m+n+p \geq 1} \omega_{m,n,p}(x_2, \mu^{-1} h D_2)(x_1^2 + \mu^{-2} h^2 D_1^2)^m \mu^{-2n-p} h^p \tag{0.6}$$

with the principal part

$$(\mu^2 x_1^2 + h^2 D_1^2) + V(x_2, \mu^{-1} h D_2) \tag*{(0.6)$_0$}$$

and for $d = 3$ in the smooth case one can reduce operator further to microlocal canonical form

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^2 \sum_{m+n+p+q \geq 1} & \omega_{m,q,k,p}(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1} h D_2) \times \\ & \times (x_1^2 + \mu^{-2} h^2 D_1^2)^m (h D_3)^q \mu^{-2m-2q-2k-p} h^p \end{aligned} \tag{0.7}$$

with the principal part

$$(0.7)_0 \qquad (\mu^2 x_1^2 + h^2 D_1^2) + h^2 D_3^2 + V(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1} h D_2).$$

Decomposing into Hermitian functions of $\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_1$ one can replace harmonic oscillator $(h^2 D_1^2 + \mu^2 x_1^2)$ by its eigenvalues $(2j+1)\mu h$, $j \in bZ^+$. So, basically for $d = 2$ our operator is a kind of mixture of the usual second order operator and a family of $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo's while for $d = 3$ it is a kind of mixture of usual second order operator and a family of h-differential 1-dimensional Schrödinger operators with respect to x_3 which are also $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo's with respect to x_2. This explains major differences between $d = 2$ and $d = 3$:

For $d = 2$ there are sharp Landau levels $(2j+1)\mu h$ (the eigenvalues of the infinite multiplicity as $g^{ik} = V = \text{const}$); without non-degeneracy condition one cannot expect remainder estimate better than $O(\mu h^{-1})$ and with non-degeneracy condition one can improve it up to $O(\mu^{-1} h^{-1} + 1)$ because only $\asymp (\mu h)^{-1}$ of Landau levels are not classically forbidden.

For $d = 3$ Landau levels are rather bottoms of the branches of the continuous spectrum and the non-degeneracy condition is not that crucial: the best possible remainder estimate is $O(h^{-2} + \mu h^{-1})$ while the worst possible remainder estimate depends on the smoothness of the reduced operator (presuming nothing wrong happened during reduction) and is $O(h^{-2} + \mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}})$ in the heuristic accordance with [Ivr5].

For $d \geq 4$ Landau levels are $\sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} (2j_k + 1) f_k \mu h$ where $f_k > 0$, $\pm i f_k$ are non-zero eigenvalues of the matrix magnetic intensity F, $2r = \operatorname{rank} F$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}$, and one can think operator to be similar to 2-dimensional as $\operatorname{rank} F = d$ and to 3-dimensional as $\operatorname{rank} F < d$ but there is no complete canonical form even if $\operatorname{rank} F$ and multiplicities of f_k are constant because $\sum_k j_k f_k$ can vanish for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ at some points (resonances). Because of this there no complete sharp results even in the smooth case (see [Dim] for incomplete and [Rai1, Rai2, Rai3, Rai4, Rai5] for non-sharp results). However I plan to tackle this case in few papers ([Ivr6, Ivr7] etc).

0.3 Non-smooth case: heuristics as $d = 2$

In non-smooth case we do not have complete canonical form but we do not need it. Further, if magnetic field is not very strong we do not need even logarithmic uncertainty principle $\varepsilon \geq C\sqrt{\mu^{-1} h |\log h|}$ to justify quantization of $V(x_2, \xi_2)$ (we do not quantize it in this case). Consider x_2-shift for time T in the propagation. Note that it does not exceed $c\mu^{-1}T$ and under non-degeneracy condition $|\partial_{\xi_2} V| \geq \epsilon$ the shift is exactly of magnitude $\mu^{-1}T$ as $T \leq \epsilon\mu$. This shift is "observable" on the "quantum level" and the propagator trace vanishes provided logarithmic uncertainty principle $\mu^{-1}T \times \varepsilon \geq C\mu^{-1} h |\log h|$ holds; here both x_2- and ξ_2-scales are ε. In order to be able to take T as small as $T_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ we need to pick up $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ which in addition to semiclassical remainder estimate $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}$ brings an approximation error $O(h^{-2}\varepsilon^{l}|\log h|^{-\sigma})$ for coefficients belonging to $C^{l,\sigma}$. This error will be small for $\mu\le h^{1-\delta}$ and $\delta = 2/(l+2)$ which would take care of $\mu \le h^{1-\delta}$ in the smooth case but we do not have such luxury now.

As μ grows larger we need to treat our operator as a family of $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo's and then we need the logarithmic uncertainty principle $\varepsilon \ge C\sqrt{\mu^{-1}h|\log h|}$ which in addition to semiclassical remainder estimate $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}$ brings an approximation error $O\bigl(h^{-2}\varepsilon^{l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + \mu h^{-1}\varepsilon^{\bar{l}}|\log h|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\bigr)$ where we assume that $g^{jk}, F \in C^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$. An actual reduction and calculations are the very big part of our analysis.

For the best results we need to pick $\varepsilon = C\min\bigl(\mu h|\log h|, \sqrt{\mu^{-1}h|\log h|}\bigr)$ and the threshold is $\mu = (h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Below it magnetic field is considered to be *weak* and above it *strong* (and we treat these two cases differently). The second threshold is $\mu = h^{-1}$; for μ above it we modify our conditions and only finite number of Landau levels matter; we call magnetic field *extra-strong* then.

0.4 Non-smooth case: heuristics as $d = 3$

In contrast to 2-dimensinal case, there is a movement along x_3 with the speed $|\xi_3|$ and for time T shift with respect to x_3 is $\asymp T\cdot|\xi_3|$ (provided $|\xi_3|\ge C\mu^{-1}$ and $T\le|\xi_3|$). This shift is "observable" on the "quantum level" and the propagator trace vanishes provided the logarithmic uncertainty principle $T|\xi_3|\times|\xi_3|\ge Ch|\log h|$ holds; also we need to assume that $\varepsilon\times|\xi_3|\ge Ch|\log h|$. Here scale with respect to ξ_3 is $\epsilon|\xi_3|$. Plugging $T = T_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ we arrive to inequality

$$|\xi_3| \ge \bar{\varrho} = C\max\bigl(\mu^{-1}, \sqrt{\mu h|\log h|}\bigr)$$

and also we need to take $\varepsilon = Ch|\log h|/|\xi_3|$. Then the contribution of the outer zone $\{|\xi_3|\ge\bar{\varrho}\}$ to the approximation error will be $O(h^{-2})$ under $C^{1,2}$ regularity of the coefficients. Further, in this case one can replace $T_1 = \epsilon|\xi_3|$ by a bit larger $T_1 = \epsilon|\xi_3|\bigl|\log|\xi_3|\bigr|^2$ and then the contribution of this zone to the remainder does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\int T_1^{-1}d\xi_3$ which does not exceed Ch^{-2} for this increased T_1.

On the other hand, the contribution of the inner zone $\{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\varrho}\}$ to the remainder does not exceed $C\mu\bar{\varrho}h^{-2}$ which in turn does not exceed Ch^{-2} as $\mu\le(h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. In this case we take $\varepsilon = Ch\log h\bar{\varrho}^{-1}$ in the inner zone and then its contribution to the approximation error does not exceed Ch^{-2} as well. In fact we will increase this threshold to $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

For $\mu\ge h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ we will consider the outer zone in the same way as above but in the inner zone $\{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\rho}\}$ we will treat our operator as a family of 1-dimensional Scrödinger operators. Then one needs to take $\varepsilon = Ch|\log h|/|\xi_3|$ in this zone as well. Now theory breaks in two cases.

- Without non-degeneracy condition. Here we apply in rather straight forward manner arguments of section 2 of [Ivr5].
- Under non-degeneracy condition. It is still not very useful to use shift with respect to x_3, x_2, ξ_2 because it lands us with $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ which leads to the total approximation error $O(h^{-2})$ only under excessive smoothness assumptions. The role of this condition is more humble: after $|\xi_3|^2$-partition with respect to x_2, x_3, ξ_2 this condition assures that the ellipticity condition fails only for elements with the total relative measure $\asymp \min\bigl(|\xi_3|^2/\mu h, 1\bigr)$ and this leads us in the end to both remainder and approximation error not exceeding Ch^{-2}. The logarithmic uncertainty principle requires condition $|\xi_3| \ge Ch^{\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{3}}$ which can be weaken to $|\xi_3| \ge Ch^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Zone $\{|\xi_3| \le Ch^{\frac{1}{3}}$ is small enough and its total contribution does not exceed Ch^{-2} as well.

Finally, for $\mu \ge h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ the outer zone disappears.

0.5 Canonical form and the final answer in the non-smooth case

Our canonical form contains important terms beyond its principal part given by $(0.6)_0$ or $(0.7)_0$ for $d = 2, 3$ respectively. The next term will be $W'(x_2, \mu^{-1}hD_2)$ or $W'(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2)$ respectively with $W' = W - V$ where in the case of the Euclidean metrics g^{jk} and constant magnetic field F effective potential W is equal (modulo $O(\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma})$ to an average of V along circumference $\{(x'_2, \xi'_2, x'_3) : |x'_2 - x_2|^2 + |\xi'_2 - \xi_2|^2 = -\mu^{-2}V(x_2, x_3, \xi_2), x'_3 = x_3\}$. Then in the smooth case $W' = -\frac{1}{4}\mu^{-2}V\Delta_\perp V + O(\mu^{-4})$ with the Laplacian in the plane orthogonal to magnetic lines but nothing better than $W' \le \mu^{-l}$ is possible in C^l-case with $l < 2$. It will affect our answer.

0.6 Assumptions and results as $d = 2$

Now let us describe the results. Let quantify our assumptions first: namely we assume that

$$c^{-1} \le \sum_{jk} g^{jk}\xi_j\xi_k \le c \qquad \forall \xi : |\xi| = 1, \tag{0.8}$$

$$g^{jk}, F^j \in C^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}\bigl(B(0,1)\bigr), \tag{0.9}$$

$$\exists n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ :\ V + (2n+1)\mu hF \in C^{l,\sigma} \tag{0.10}$$

$$|\nabla\bigl(\frac{V}{F}\bigr)| + \min_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^+} |V + (2n+1)F\mu h| \ge c^{-1}, \tag{0.11}$$

$$\psi \in C_0^K\bigl(B(0, \frac{1}{2})\bigr), \quad 0 \le \psi \le 1 \tag{0.12}$$

with *all smoothness conditions understood uniformly*, which means that corresponding norms do not exceed c.

Then for $\mu h \gg 1$ condition (0.10) is fulfilled with unique $n=\bar n$ and we refer to it as (0.10_n); further in this case we need to check condition (0.11) with $n=\bar n$ only.

On the other hand, for $\mu h \le c$ condition (0.10) holds or fails for all $n \le c(\mu h)^{-1}$ simultaneously and for $\mu h \ll 1$ non-degeneracy condition (0.11) is equivalent to

$$|\nabla(\frac{V}{F})| \ge c^{-1}. \tag{0.11'}$$

Finally, we assume that $(\bar l, \bar\sigma) \succeq (l,\sigma)$ [10] and K is large enough.

Theorem 0.1. *Let $d=2$ and A be a self-adjoint in $L^2(X)$ operator given by (0.1). Let conditions (0.2),(0.5)*,(0.8)) − (0.12) be fulfilled in $B(0,1)\subset X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $1\le l\le 3$ and with $\sigma \ge 1$ as $l=1$.*

(i) Let $(\bar l,\bar\sigma)=(l,\sigma)$, $\mu \le Ch^{-\frac12}$ and let

$$V \le -c^{-1} \qquad \text{in } B(0,1). \tag{0.13}$$

Then estimate

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde e(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{W}}(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx| \le \\ C\mu^{-1}h^{-1} + C\mu^2 + Ch^{-2}(\mu h)^l |\log h|^{l-\sigma} \tag{0.14}$$

holds with standard Weyl expression $\mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau) = \frac{1}{4\pi}h^{-2}\bigl(\tau - V(x)\bigr)_+\sqrt{g}$ where here and below $g=\det(g_{jk})^{-1}$ and $\tilde e(x,y,\tau)$ is the Schwartz kernel of the spectral projector of some approximate operator $\tilde A$ [11].

(ii) Let $(h|\log h|)^{-\frac13} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$ and $(\bar l,\bar\sigma)=(2,1)$. Let condition (0.13) be fulfilled. Then for two framing approximations as in footnote [11] estimate

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde e(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0) - \mathcal{E}_{2\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx| \le \\ C\mu^{-1}h^{-1} + C(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}h^{-2}|\log h|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma} \tag{0.15}$$

---

[10] Which means that either $l<\bar l$ or $l=\bar l, \sigma\le\bar\sigma$.

[11] One can take two copies $\tilde A^{\pm}$ of approximation such that (0.14) holds for both and $\tilde A^- \le A \le \tilde A^+$ in the operator sense. We call them framing approximations. This remark holds for theorems 0.1, 0.3, 0.4, 0.6 in full.

holds with magnetic Weyl expression

$$\mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{n\ge 0}\theta\bigl(\tau-V-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)\mu h^{-1}F\sqrt{g} \tag{0.16}$$

where $\theta(\tau)=\tau_+^0$ *is Heaviside function and with correction term*

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{E}_{2\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x)=\\ \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{n\ge 0}\Bigl(\theta\bigl(\tau-W-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)-\theta\bigl(\tau-W-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)\Bigr)\mu h^{-1}F+\\ \frac{1}{2\pi}(W-V)h^{-2}\end{gathered} \tag{0.17}$$

with appropriate corrected potential W 12)*.*

(iii) Let $\mu\ge Ch^{-1}$ *and* $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})\succeq(2,1)$*. Then for two framing approximations as in footnote* 11) *estimate*

$$\begin{gathered}|\int\Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)-\mathcal{E}_{2\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le\\ C+C\mu h^{-1}(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log\mu|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma}+C\mu^2(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{\bar{l}}{2}}|\log\mu|^{\frac{\bar{l}}{2}-\bar{\sigma}}\end{gathered} \tag{0.18}$$

holds with $\mathcal{E}_{2\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ *given again by* (0.17) 13)*.*

(iv) On the other hand, in frames of (iii) with (0.11) *replaced by*

$$\min_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^+}|V+(2n+1)F\mu h|\ge c^{-1}, \tag{0.21}$$

estimate

$$|\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}_2^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)|\le C_s\mu^{-s}\qquad\forall x\in B(0,\frac{1}{2}) \tag{0.22}$$

---

12) Expression for W is rather complicated and is given in section 4 but for Euclidean metrics it is described in subsection 0.5; here I want just notice that the correction term is $O(h^{-2}\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma})$.

13) However now $W=V+W'h^2$ with

$$W'=-\frac{1}{12}\kappa\bigl(4\bar{n}^2F+4\bar{n}+3\bigr)+F^{\frac12}\sum_{j,k}\partial_j\bigl(g^{jk}\partial_kF^{-\frac12}\bigr) \tag{0.19}$$

and κ a curvature associated with metrics $g^{jk}F^{-1}$ (and this correction is not due to the lack of the smoothness);

$$g^{jk}F^{-1}=\alpha^2\delta_{jk}\implies\kappa=2\Delta\log\alpha. \tag{0.20}$$

Furher the sum in (0.18) contains only a finite number of terms one can skip term $\frac{1}{4\pi}(W-V)h^{-2}$ there.

holds.

Remark 0.2. (i) Replacement of condition (0.5)* by (0.5) affects only correction term and it exceeds remainder only for $\mu h \ge 1$.

(ii) We get the optimal remainder estimate $O(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+1)$ if $(l,\sigma)=(2,1)$; for $\mu h\ge 1$ we need also to assume that $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})=(4,2)$.

(iii) We have this optimal remainder estimate in statement (i) iff $l>1$, $\mu\le Ch^{-(l-1)/(l+1)}|\log h|^{\sigma/}$

(iv) On the other hand, we can skip $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{2\mathrm{corr}}$ in statement (ii) and still have the optimal remainder estimate iff $l>1$, $\mu\ge \epsilon h^{-1/(l-1)}|\log h|^{-\sigma/(l-1)}$. Cases (iii), (iv) overlap for $(l,\sigma)=(3,1)$.

(v) Using rescaling technique we will be able in section 9 to get rid of condition (0.13).

0.7 Assumptions and results: $d=3$

As I mentioned, three-dimensional case is a kind of mixture of three-dimensional and one-dimensional Schrödinger operators without magnetic field. Due to this while we derive spectral asymptotics with remainder estimate no better than $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1})$ we can always get some remainder estimate without non-degeneracy (microhyperbolicity) condition (0.11). In particular for not very strong magnetic field sharp remainder estimate holds for sure:

Theorem 0.3. *Let $d=3$ and A be a self-adjoint in $L^2(X)$ operator given by (0.1). Let conditions (0.2),(0.5)*,(0.8) $-$ (0.10), (0.12), (0.13) be fulfilled in $B(0,1)\subset X\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ with $(l,\sigma)=(2,1)$.*

(i) Let $\mu\le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Then for two framing approximations as in footnote $^{11)}$ *estimate*

$$|\int\Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{W}}_3(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le Ch^{-2} \tag{0.23}$$

holds with standard Weyl expression $\mathcal{E}^{W}_3(x,\tau)=\frac{1}{6\pi^2}h^{-3}\bigl(\tau-V(x)\bigr)_+^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{g}$.

(ii) Let $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})=(2,1)$. Then above statement remains true for $\mu\le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

For $\mu\ge h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ non-degenerate and degenerate cases are different. First I consider non-degenerate case:

Theorem 0.4. *Let $d=3$ and A be a self-adjoint in $L^2(X)$ operator given by (0.1). Let conditions (0.2),(0.5)*,(0.8) $-$ (0.12) be fulfilled in $B(0,1)\subset X\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ with $(1,2)\preceq(l,\sigma)\preceq(2,1)$ and $n=0$ in condition (0.10).*

(i) Let $\mu \le Ch^{-1}$, $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})=(l,\sigma)$ *and let condition* (*0.13*) *be fulfilled. Then asymptotics*

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}_3^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx| \le Ch^{-2}+Ch^{-3}(\mu h)^{l+\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{l+\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} \tag{0.24}$$

holds with *magnetic Weyl expression*

$$\mathcal{E}_3^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)=\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\sum_{n\ge 0}\bigl(\tau - V-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)_+^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu h^{-2}F. \tag{0.25}$$

(ii) Let $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$, $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})=(2,1)$ *and let condition* (*0.13*) *be fulfilled. Then asymptotics*

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}_3^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)-\mathcal{E}_{3\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx| \le Ch^{-2} \tag{0.26}$$

holds holds with magnetic Weyl expression (*0.25*) *and with* *correction term*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{3\mathrm{corr}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x) &= \\ &\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\sum_{n\ge 0}\Bigl(\bigl(\tau - W-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)_+^{\frac{1}{2}}-\bigl(\tau - V-(2n+1)\mu hF\bigr)_+^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr)\mu h^{-1}F- \\ &\qquad\qquad \frac{1}{6\pi^2}(W_-^{\frac{3}{2}}-V_-^{\frac{3}{2}})h^{-3}\end{aligned} \tag{0.27}$$

with appropriate *corrected potential* W [14]*.*

(iii) Let $h^{-1}\le\mu$ *and* $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})=(2,1)$*. Then for two framing approximations as in footnote* [11] *estimate*

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}_3^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx| \le C\mu h^{-1} \tag{0.28}$$

holds with magnetic Weyl expression given by (*0.26*).

Remark 0.5. Using rescaling technique we will be able in section 9 to get rid of condition (0.13) in the previous and in the next theorems.

Now we are going to drop condition (0.11) as $d=3$.

---

[14] Expression for W is rather complicated and is given in section 4 but for Euclidean metrics it is described in subsection 0.5; here I want just notice that the correction term is $O(h^{-\frac{5}{2}}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma})$.

Theorem 0.6. *Let $d=3$ and A be a self-adjoint in $L^2(X)$ operator given by (0.1). Let conditions (0.2),(0.5)*,(0.8) $-$ (0.10), (0.12) be fulfilled in $B(0,1)\subset X\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $(1,2)\preceq (l,\sigma)\preceq (2,1)$ and $n=0$ in condition (0.10).*

(i) Let $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}\le \mu\le h^{-1}$ and condition (0.13) be fulfilled. Then for two framing approximations as in footnote [11] *estimate*

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{\mathrm{corr}}(x)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le \\ Ch^{-2}+C\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} \tag{0.29}$$

holds [15]*.*

Further,

$$|\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{\mathrm{corr}}|\le C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}-l}h^{-\frac{5}{2}}|\log h|^{-\sigma}+C\mu^{1-\frac{l}{2}}h^{-2}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \tag{0.30}$$

and can be skipped as either $\mu\ge h^{-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$ or $l=2$, $\sigma\ge 0$.

(ii) For $\mu\ge h^{-1}$ estimate

$$|\int \Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,0)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le C\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} \tag{0.31}$$

holds.

0.8 Plan of the paper

1. *Preliminary analysis.* We make few preliminary remarks.
2. *$d=2$ and magnetic field is relatively weak.* Using "precanonical form" we prove statement (i) of theorem 0.1.
3. *$d=2$ and magnetic field is relatively strong. Canonical form.* We derive "poor man canonical form" for $\mu\ge Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$: the true (complete) canonical form does not exist because we lack the infinite smoothness. However precanonical form exists with rather small error but we need to plug corrected potential W instead of V and their difference is the source of correction term.
4. *$d=2$: Proof of Theorem 0.1.* We prove statements (ii),(iii) of theorem 0.1 (i) and basically finish two-dimensional case.

---

[15] Note that the second term in the right-hand expression prevails as $\mu\ge h^{-l/(l+2)}|\log h|^{\sigma/(l+2)}$.

5. *$d=3$ and magnetic field is relatively weak.* We analyze the "outer zone" $\{|\xi_3|\ge C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\mu^{-1}\}$ (if (x_3,ξ_3) are "free"("non-magnetic") variables) and prove that the contribution of this zone to the remainder is $O(h^{-2})$; then we prove instantly theorem 0.3 for $\mu\le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

6. *$d=3$ and magnetic field is relatively strong. Canonical form.* We derive "poor man canonical form" for $\mu\ge Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$.

7. *"Standard" spectral asymptotics.* We analyze the "outer zone" as $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}\le\mu\le Ch^{-1}$.

8. *Spectral asymptotics.* We analyze inner zone $\{|\xi_3|\le C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$ and finish the proof of theorem 0.1 (for $\mu\le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ now) and prove theorems 0.4, 0.6.

9. *Spectral asymptotics. Vanishing V or F.* We get rid of condition (0.13) and discuss consequences of violation of (0.5).

1 Preliminary analysis

1.1 Standard results rescaled

By *standard results* we mean results for $\mu=1$. While rescaling final spectral asymptotics by $x\mapsto\mu x$, $h\mapsto\mu h$ we would get the standard remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d})$ converted into $O\bigl((\mu h)^{1-d}\cdot\mu^d\bigr)=O(\mu h^{1-d})$, something which we want to improve, rescaling of the intermediate results will be much more fruitful.

Let us consider some (γ,ρ)-admissible partition in (x,ξ) and ε-mollification with respect to x with ε depending on (x,ξ) such that[16)]

$$C_s\rho^{-1}h|\log h|\le\varepsilon\le\gamma. \tag{1.1}$$

At first we assume that ε is a numerical small parameter.

Let $\tilde{A}$ be such approximate operator and $\tilde{e}(x,y,\tau)$ be its spectral projector. Let $u(x,y,t)$ be the Schwartz kernel of the corresponding propagator $\mathbf{U}(t)=e^{-ih^{-1}t\tilde{A}}$ (we will never consider propagator for non-mollified operator).

Proposition 1.1. *Let ε be a small numerical parameter and*

$$\mu\le C_s^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}. \tag{1.2}$$

[16)] In fact both γ and especially ρ could be vectors and then (1.1) should hold for components.

(i) Then

$$|\int \bar{\phi}_\zeta(\tau)\Bigl(d_\tau \tilde{e}(x,x,\tau) - F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)u(x,x,t)\bigr)d\tau\Bigr)| \le Ch^s \tag{1.3}$$

provided $\bar{\phi}(\tau)=1$ *for* $\tau<-1$, $\bar{\phi}(\tau)=0$ *for* $\tau>-\frac{1}{2}$, $\bar{\chi}(t)=1$ *for* $|t|\le\frac{1}{2}$, $\bar{\chi}(t)=0$ *for* $|t|\ge 1$ [17], $T=T_0\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$ *with small enough constant* $\epsilon_0>0$, $\zeta\ge C_s\mu h|\log h|$ [18] *and* $\bar{\chi}_T(t)=\bar{\chi}(t/T)$, $\bar{\phi}_\zeta(\tau)=\bar{\phi}(\tau/\zeta)$*;*

(ii) Moreover

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)-\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t)\Bigr)u(x,x,t)|\le Ch^s \tag{1.5}$$

with $T=T_0$ *and* $\bar{T}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C_sh|\log h|$,

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t)\Bigl(u(x,x,t)-u^0(x,x,t)\Bigr)|\le Ch^{2-d} \tag{1.6}$$

with

$$u^0(x,x,t)\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\int e^{ih^{-1}t\tau}d_\tau\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau) \tag{1.7}$$

and

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t)\bigl(u(x,x,t)-u^0_{\mathrm{st}}(x,x,t)\bigr)|\le C\mu^2h^{3-d}+Ch^{1-d}\vartheta(h) \tag{1.8}$$

with

$$u^0_{\mathrm{st}}(x,x,t)\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\int e^{ih^{-1}t\tau}d_\tau\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau) \tag{1.9}$$

where both $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau)$ *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ *are constructed for mollified operator* $\tilde{A}$ *and* $\vartheta(t)=t^l|\log t|^{-\sigma}$.

---

[17] We pick up all auxiliary functions ϕ, χ etc satisfying assumption of [BrIvr]:

$$|D^\alpha f|\le (CN)^{(|\alpha|-m)_+}\quad \forall\alpha:|\alpha|\le N=\epsilon_s|\log h| \tag{1.4}$$

with large enough exponent m.

[18] So ζ and T also satisfy logarithmic uncertainty principle $\zeta\cdot T\ge C_sh|\log h|$.

Proof. Proof of (1.3) is standard because in the scale $x \mapsto \mu x$, $t \mapsto \mu t$, $\tau \mapsto \mu^{-1}\tau$, $\mu \mapsto 1$, $h \mapsto \mu h$ we have the standard case (with $\mu = 1$). Note that

$$\int \bar{\phi}_\zeta(\tau) F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)u(x,x,t)\Bigr)d\tau = \bar{\phi}_\zeta(hD_t)\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)u(x,x,t)\Bigr)\Bigr|_{t=0}. \tag{1.10}$$

Inequalities (1.5) and (1.6)-(1.7) also follow from the same rescaling arguments applied to standard results of section 5 of [BrIvr]. For (1.8)-(1.9) one should remember how u is constructed for $|t| \le C_s h|\log h|$ by the successive approximation method; see section 4.2 of [Ivr1] and section 5 of [BrIvr]. However, as an unperturbed operator one can also take

$$\bar{A}(x,y,hD_x) = \sum_{j,k} g^{jk}(y)\bar{P}_j\bar{P}_k + V(y), \qquad \bar{P}_j = hD_j - \mu V_j(y;x) \tag{1.11}$$

with $V_j(y;x) = V_j(y) + \langle \nabla V_j(y), x-y\rangle$ rather than more standard $V_j(y)$ (where the former includes magnetic field and the latter does not) and here we must plug mollified $\tilde{g}^{jk}$, $\tilde{V}_j$, $\tilde{V}$ instead of the original (non-mollified) coefficients.

One can see easily that for such operator the restriction of the spectral kernel to the diagonal $\bar{e}(y,y,\tau)$ is exactly $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(y,\tau)$ and that all other terms of successive approximation contribute no more than $O(h^{-2})$. Really, the contribution of the k-th term does not exceed $Ch^{-2-k}T^{2k-2}$ with $T = h|\log h|$. Thus contribution of any term with $k \ge 3$ is clearly $O(h^{-2})$ while contribution of the second term is at most $O(h^2|\log h|^2)$. Analysis of section 5 of [BrIvr] (based on rescaling technique) shows that one can take $T = h$ in this estimate and then the contribution of the second term does not exceed Ch^{-2} as well. It implies estimates (1.6)-(1.7).

To prove (1.8)-(1.9) we need to use the same construction but with the standard unperturbed operator $\bar{A}(y,hD_x)$ instead; it is given by (1.11) with $\bar{P}_j = hD_j - V_j(y)$. Then one can estimate the contribution of the k-th term in the successive approximation by $Ch^{-d+k-1}\mu^{k-1}$ and thus all the terms but the first two contribute less than $C\mu^2h^{2-d}$. The contribution of the first term is exactly $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{W}$ and the only term we need to consider is the second one

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\Bigl(\bar{G}^+(\tilde{A}-\bar{A})\bar{G}^+ - \bar{G}^-(\tilde{A}-\bar{A})\bar{G}^-\Bigr)\delta(x-y) \tag{1.12}$$

where $\bar{G}^\pm$ are respectively forward and backward parametrices of evolution operator $hD_t - \bar{A}$. One can see easily that

$$\tilde{A}-\bar{A} = R_0 + R_1 + R_2, \qquad R_0 = \langle x-y, \nabla_y \tilde{A}(y,hD_x)\rangle$$

where R_1, R_2 are second order operators with the coefficients $O\bigl(\mu^2|x-y|^2\bigr)$ and $O\bigl(\vartheta(|x-y|)\bigr)$ respectively. Then the contributions of the term given by (1.8) with $\tilde{A}-\bar{A}$ replaced by R_0

will be identically 0 due to standard calculations while the similar contributions for R_1, R_2 will not exceed $C\mu^2h^{2-d}$ and $Ch^{-d}\vartheta(h)$ respectively due to the same arguments of section 5 [BrIvr]. $\square$

1.2 Comparing $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}$

We need to compare $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ and $\int\psi(x)\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)dx$ with $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ and $\int\psi(x)\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)dx$ respectively. The first comparison is easy:

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)|\le C\cdot\begin{cases}(1+\mu h)h^{-3}\vartheta(\varepsilon)+\mu h^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon)^{\frac12} & \text{for } d=3\\ (1+\mu h)h^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon)+\mu h^{-1} & \text{for } d=2\end{cases}\tag{1.13}$$

while the same difference between $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau)$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ obviously would not exceed $Ch^{-d}\vartheta(\varepsilon)$.

Proposition 1.2. *Under non-degeneracy condition (0.11)*

$$|\int\psi(x)\Bigl(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\Bigr)dx|\le C(1+\mu h)h^{-d}\vartheta(\varepsilon)\tag{1.14}$$

for $|\tau|\le\epsilon$.

Proof. We need to prove (1.4) only as $\vartheta(\varepsilon)\le\epsilon\mu h$; otherwise it will follow from (1.13).

Consider $d=2$ first. Let us introduce γ-admissible partition of unity with $\gamma=\epsilon\vartheta(\varepsilon)$. If $|V+(2j+1)\mu hF-\tau|\ge C\gamma$ for all $j\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ on some element of the partition, then on this element $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ coincide while on all other elements their difference does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}$. However, due to (0.11) the total area of the latter elements does not exceed $C\gamma(1+\mu^{-1}h^{-1})$ which yields the necessary estimate.

Consider now $d=3$. Then

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)|\le C\bigl(1+\mu h\gamma(x)^{-\frac12}\bigr)h^{-3}\vartheta(\varepsilon)\tag{1.15}$$

with $\gamma(x)=\min_j|V+(2j+1)\mu hF|$. Due to condition (0.11) function $\gamma(x)^{-\frac12}$ is integrable. $\square$

2 $d=2$ and magnetic field is relatively weak

We start from 2-dimensional case which is more transparent and clean.

2.1 Heuristics. I

The model of such operator is $h^2D_1^2(hD_2-\mu x_1)^2+V(x)$ and metaplectic map $hD_1\mapsto hD_1$, $hD_2-\mu x_1\mapsto -\mu x_1$, $x_1\mapsto x_1+\mu^{-1}hD_2$, $x_2\mapsto x_2+\mu^{-1}hD_1$ transforms this operator into

$$h^2D_1^2+\mu^2x_1^2+V(x_1+\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2+\mu^{-1}hD_1). \tag{2.1}$$

In some sense this operator is modelled by $h^2D_1^2+\mu^2x_1^2+V(\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2)$. Then along coordinates $x_2,\xi_2\sim\mu^{-1}hD_2$ singularities propagate with the speed μ^{-1} and under assumption $|\partial_{\xi_2}V|\ge c^{-1}$ for time T the shift with respect to x_2 is $\asymp\mu^{-1}T$. To satisfy logarithmic uncertainty principle we should assume that $\mu^{-1}T\cdot\varepsilon\ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log(\mu^{-1}h)|$ because $V(\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2)$ is $\mu^{-1}h$-pseudo-differential operator with respect to x_2 and ε is a characteristic size in ξ_2-variable. Therefore, $\Gamma u\overset{\text{def}}{=}\int u(x,x,t)dx$ is negligible for $T_0\le|t|\le T_1$ with $T_0\overset{\text{def}}{=}C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log(\mu^{-1}h)|$ and $T_1=\epsilon\mu$.

On the other hand, from the standard results rescaled we know Γu for $|t|\le T_1'\overset{\text{def}}{=}\epsilon\mu^{-1}$. In order these intervals to overlap we need $\varepsilon\ge C\mu h|\log h|$ and therefore $\mu\le h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$. So, we pick up the minimal possible value

$$\varepsilon=C\mu h|\log h| \tag{2.2}$$

and then the approximation error will be $Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\mu h|\log h|)$.

This construction works for pretty large μ; however, these arguments are optimal only for

$$\mu\le\bar\mu_1\overset{\text{def}}{=}h^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{-\frac13}. \tag{2.3}$$

In the next section we will manage to work with $\varepsilon=C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h|\log(\mu^{-1}h)|\bigr)^{\frac12}$ which is less than value given by (2.2) if and only if for $\mu\ge\bar\mu_1$. We need inequality $\varepsilon\ge C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h|\log(\mu^{-1}h)|\bigr)^{\frac12}$ even to consider $V(\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2)$ as a legitimate $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo. So, in the frames of this section $V(\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2)$ is not even defined properly. The short answer to this obstacle is that we should work directly with operator $V(x_1+\mu^{-1}hD_2,x_2+\mu^{-1}hD_1)$ or just not to make any reduction but still to be able to reproduce the above arguments.

2.2 Heuristics. II: Propagation of singularities

The goal of the next subsection is to prove that at the energy level 0 and below singularities propagate with respect to x_1,x_2 with the finite speed, and that with respect to "variables" $Q_j\overset{\text{def}}{=}x_j+\sum_k\beta_{jk}\mu^{-1}P_k$ (with appropriate coefficients β_{jk}) singularities propagate with the speed not exceeding $C_0\mu^{-1}$; further, the same is true for $Q'_j \overset{\text{def}}{=} Q_j + \sum_{ki}\mu^{-2}\beta'_{jki}P_kP_l$ with appropriate coefficients β'_{jki}; finally, in the latter case singularities propagate along trajectories of the "Liouvillean" field of $(V-\tau)/F$ [19].

We define β_{jk} to have Poisson brackets vanish: $\{Q_j, P_k\} \equiv 0 \mod O(\mu^{-1})$, or simply

$$Q_1 = x_1 - F^{-1}P_2, \quad Q_2 = x_2 + F^{-1}P_1, \qquad \{P_1,P_2\} = -F \tag{2.5}$$

as we would do in the smooth case; then

$$\{A^0, Q_j\} = \mu^{-1}\sum_{ki}\alpha_{jki}P_kP_i; \tag{2.6}$$

where $A^0 = A - V$. In the smooth case we would be able to eliminate α_{jkl} modulo $\omega_j A^0$ and $O(\mu^{-2})$ by an appropriate choice of coefficients β'_{jki} but now α_{jki} have "smoothness" $l-1$ and then β'_{jki} will have the same smoothness which is not enough to plug them into Poisson brackets. However, we can replace coefficients β'_{jki} by their modulo $o(1)$ approximations (obtained by mollification with mollification scale which is $o(1)$ but very slowly decaying). Then for these new coefficients we have $\{A^0, Q'_j\} \equiv \mu^{-1}\omega_j A^0$ modulo $o(\mu^{-1})$ and

$$\{A, Q'_j\} \equiv \mu^{-1}\bigl(\omega_j(\tau+V) + F^{-1}\mathcal{L}_jV - \omega_j(\tau - A)\bigr) \tag{2.7}$$

with $\mathcal{L}_j = (-1)^{j-1}\partial_{x_{2-j}}$. In the smooth case we know from Chapter 6 of [Ivr1] that $\omega_j = \mathcal{L}_jF^{-1}$ and so it should be in our case as well:

$$\{A, Q'_j\} \equiv \mu^{-1}\Bigl(\mathcal{L}_j\bigl(\frac{V-\tau}{F}\bigr) + \omega_j(\tau - A)\Bigr) \qquad \mod o(\mu^{-1}) \tag{2.8}$$

and this equality will be sufficient to prove that singularities propagate along trajectories of (2.4).

2.3 Propagation of singularities. Rigorous results

We prove the following statements:

---

[19] Namely:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \mu^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{(V-\tau)/F}, \qquad \text{with "Liouvillean" field } \mathcal{L}_v \overset{\text{def}}{=} (-\partial_{x_2}v, \partial_{x_1}v), \tag{2.4}$$

defined below

Proposition 2.1. [20]). *Let $d \ge 2$, $\mu \le h^{-1+\delta}$ and let*

$$M \ge \sup_{\sum_{jk} g^{jk}\xi_j\xi_k+V=0} 2\sum_k g^{jk}\xi_k + \epsilon \tag{2.9}$$

with arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$.

Let ϕ_1 be supported in $B(0,1)$, $\phi_2 = 1$ in $B(0,2)$, χ be supported in $[-1,1]$ (I remind that all such auxiliary functions are appropriate in the sense of [BrIvr] *). Let $\bar{T}_0 = Ch|\log h| \le T \le T_1' = \epsilon_0$.*

Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(1-\phi_{2,MT}(x-\bar{x})\bigr)\phi_{1,MT}(y-\bar{x})u(x,y,t)| \le Ch^s \qquad \forall \tau \le \epsilon_1 \tag{2.10}$$

where here and below $\epsilon_1 > 0$ is a small enough constant.

Proposition 2.2. [21]) *Let $d = 2$ and condition (0.5) be fulfilled.*

(i) Let $M \ge \sup|F\mathcal{L}_{V/F}| + \epsilon$ with arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$. Let

$$T_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h| + C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le T \le T_1 = \epsilon_0\mu. \tag{2.11}$$

Then for $\mu_0 \le \mu \le h^{-1+\delta}$

$$\begin{gathered}|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(1-\phi_{2,M\mu^{-1}T}(Q_1-\bar{x}_1,Q_2-\bar{x}_2)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}\times\\ \times\, u(x,y,t)\bigl(\phi_{1,M\mu^{-1}T}(Q_1-\bar{x}_1,Q_2-\bar{x}_2)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}\ t}| \le Ch^s \qquad \forall\tau, |\tau| \le \epsilon_1\end{gathered} \tag{2.12}$$

where here and below $\mu_0 > 0$, C_1 are large enough constants. Here and b^{w} means Weyl quantization of symbol b and due to condition (2.11) logarithmic uncertainty principle holds and this quantization of the symbols involved is justified, B^t means dual *operator;*

In particular, for $T \ge C_1$ this inequality holds for Q_1, Q_2 replaced by x_1, x_2;

(ii) Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrarily small constant. Let χ be supported in $[1-\epsilon_1, 1+\epsilon_1]$, where ϵ_1 and μ_0 are as above.

Let $\bar{x} = \bar{y} + \mu^{-1}F\mathcal{L}_{V/F}(\bar{y})T$ with T satisfying (2.11) and $T \le \epsilon_1\mu$.

Then for $\mu_0 \le \mu \le h^{-1+\delta}$ with large enough constants M (not depending on ϵ) and μ_0

$$\begin{gathered}|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(1-\phi_{2,M\epsilon\mu^{-1}T}(Q_1-\bar{x}_1,Q_2-\bar{x}_2)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}\times\\ \times\, u(x,y,t)\bigl(\phi_{1,\epsilon\mu^{-1}T}(Q_1-\bar{y}_1,Q_2-\bar{y}_2)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}\ t}| \le Ch^s \qquad \forall\tau, |\tau| \le \epsilon_1\end{gathered} \tag{2.13}$$

In particular, for $T \ge C_1$ this inequality holds for Q_1, Q_2 replaced by x_1, x_2.

---

[20]) Finite speed of propagation with respect to x.

[21]) Propagation along magnetic lines.

Proof. Sketch of the proofs Proofs of all three statements are not very different from the proof used in Theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr]. Namely, let φ be a function picked up in the proof of that theorem as χ; it was supported in $(-\infty, 0]$ and satisfying certain "regularity" conditions. Then as a main auxiliary symbol we pick up

$$\varphi\Bigl(f(x,t)-\epsilon_3\Bigr) \qquad \text{with} \tag{2.14}$$

$$f(x,t)=\frac{1}{T}\bigl(|x-\bar{x}|^2+\epsilon_3\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mp M\frac{t}{T},$$

$$\varphi\Bigl(f\bigl(Q_1(x,\xi),Q_2(x,\xi),t\bigr)-\epsilon_3\Bigr) \qquad \text{with} \tag{2.15}$$

$$f(Q,t)=\frac{1}{T}\bigl(\mu^2|Q-\bar{Q}|^2+\epsilon_3\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mp M\frac{t}{T},$$

$$\varphi\Bigl(f\bigl(Q'_1(x,\xi),Q'_2(x,\xi),t\bigr)-\epsilon_3\Bigr) \qquad \text{with} \tag{2.16}$$

$$f(Q',t)=\frac{1}{T}\bigl(\mu^2|Q-\bar{Q}-\mu^{-1}\ell t|^2+\epsilon_3\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}}\pm\epsilon_5\frac{t}{T}$$

in the proofs of Propositions 2.1, 2.2(i), 2.2(ii) respectively where $\epsilon_k>0$ are small constants. We pick signs "$\mp$" analyzing cases $\pm t>0$. Here $\ell=F\mathcal{L}_{\frac{V}{F}}$ if $\mu^{-1}T<\epsilon_6$ in the proof of proposition 2.2(ii). We extend it to $\mu^{-1}T<\epsilon_0$ by steps. ☐

Proposition 2.3. *Let $d=2$, $l=1,\sigma>1$ and conditions (0.5), (0.11) be fulfilled. Let χ be supported in $[-1,-\frac{1}{2}]\cup[\frac{1}{2},1]$. Then for*

$$\mu_0\le\mu\le Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.17}$$

and T satisfying (2.11)

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\phi(x)u\bigr)\Bigr)|\le Ch^s \qquad \forall\tau:|\tau|\le\epsilon. \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. For $\mu\le\epsilon' h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and for $\mu\ge\epsilon' h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, $\mu^{-1}T\ge\varepsilon$ with small enough constant ϵ' this statement follows immediately from proposition 2.2(ii).

However, for $\mu\ge\epsilon' h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ we need to prove this statement for $T\in[\bar{T}'_0,T_0]$; in this case $\mu^{-1}T_0\le\varepsilon$.

One can assume without any loss of the generality that $|\mathcal{L}_{V/F}x_1|\ge\epsilon$ and $p_2=\xi_2$; then $Q_1=x_1+\alpha\xi_2$ with $\alpha=(\partial_{x_2}V_1)^{-1}$, where $(\partial_{x_2}V_1)^{-1}$ is disjoint from 0.

Then we can use function (2.16) with

$$f=\frac{1}{T}\bigl(\mu(Q_1-\bar{Q}_1)\pm\epsilon_5 t\bigr). \tag{2.19}$$

In this case we can take $C\mu^{-1}T$-scale with respect to x_1 and ξ_2 and $ChT^{-1}|\log h|$-scale with respect to x_2 and ξ_1 provided either $\mu \le \epsilon'(h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $|\partial_{x_2}\alpha| \le \epsilon'|\log h|^{-1}$ in y with sufficiently small ϵ' and then in its ε-vicinity (since $\sigma > 1$). However, one can reach it by just rescaling $x_2 \mapsto x_2 + kx_2^2$. □

The following corollary follows immediately from proposition 2.2(ii):

Corollary 2.4. *Statement (ii) of proposition 2.2 remains true for all T satisfying (2.11) if we redefine $\bar{x}$ as $\bar{x} = \Psi_T(\bar{y})$ where Ψ_t is Liouvillean flow defined by (2.4).*

2.4 Proof of Theorem 0.1(i)

Now we are ready to prove statement (i) of Theorem 0.1:

Proof. Due to proposition 2.3 and estimate (1.5) we have

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\big(\bar{\chi}_T(t) - \bar{\chi}_{T'}(t)\big)\Gamma\big(\phi(x)u\big)\Big)| \le Ch^s \tag{2.20}$$

with $T = T_1 = \epsilon\mu$ and $T' = T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$.

On the other hand, due to rescaling arguments one can build $u(x, x, t)$ by the standard means on interval $[-\bar{T}, \bar{T}]$ with $\bar{T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon\mu^{-1}$.

We want these intervals to overlap: $\bar{T} \ge T_0$ which is equivalent to inequality $\varepsilon \ge C\mu h|\log h|$ and we pick up minimal possible ε given by (2.1). Then *inequality (2.20) holds with $T = T_1$ and $T' = \bar{T}$.*

Then, since inequality

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma\big(\phi(x)u\big)\Big)| \le Ch^{1-d} \tag{2.21}$$

holds for $T = \bar{T}$, *the same inequality holds for $T = T_1$ as well.* Therefore due to standard the Tauberian procedure

$$|\Gamma\big(e(.,.,0)\phi\big) - h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\big(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(u\phi)\big)\Big)d\tau| \le \frac{C}{T_1}h^{1-d} \tag{2.22}$$

with $T = T_1$ and thus due to (2.20) the same inequality holds with $T = \bar{T}$.

Further, due to proposition 1.1(ii) we can replace

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\big(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma_x(u)\big)\Big)d\tau$$

by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,0)$ with an error $O(\mu^2)$. Furthermore, the difference between "averaged with respect to spatial variables" (multiplied by $\phi(x)dx$ and integrated) functions $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,0)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)$ is $O(\mu^2)$ as well.

Thus semiclassical remainder estimate is $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\bigr)$. Finally, due to proposition 1.2 approximation errors in "averaged with respect to spatial variables" $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ are $O\bigl(h^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ with $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ which implies remainder estimate $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{-1} + \mu^2 + h^{-2}\vartheta(\mu h|\log h|)\bigr)$ as long as $\mu \le h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$. $\square$

Remark 2.5. (i) For $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ term μ^2 in the right-hand expression of (0.14) does not exceed $\mu^{-1}h^{-1}$.

(ii) We can skip $O(\mu^2)$ in the remainder estimate if we include in formula the corresponding term in the standard expression for $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)u(x,x,t)$ which is equivalent (modulo $O(\mu^4h^2)$) to replacement $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{W}}$ by $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}$. This takes care of $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and there is very little sense to push it further in this statement.

3 $d = 2$ and magnetic field is relatively strong. Canonical form

Now we analyze the case

$$\bar{\mu}_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le \bar{\mu}_2 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}; \tag{3.1}$$

the second restriction will be removed in subsection 3.4.

Our arguments will not change much for larger μ as well but some of them become much simpler while other become a bit more complicated. We will take

$$\mu^{-1} \ge \varepsilon \ge C\sqrt{\mu^{-1}h|\log h|} \tag{3.2}$$

which makes it possible to use $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos.

3.1 Canonical form. Main part of operator. I

Now our goal is to reduce our operator to a some kind of the canonical form. It would be easier for constant or at least smooth g^{jk} and F. However, we can overcome technical difficulties in a more general case as well. Instead of normal FIO we will use "poor man FIO". *In this section for a sake of simplicity of some arguments we assume that $\sigma \ge 0$ but one can get rid of this assumption easily*.

In this subsection we will reduce A^0 to pre-canonical form which is really easy for constant metrics g^{jk} and F and is not needed at all for Euclidean metrics and constant F.

First of all, we can assume without any loss of generality that

$$F^3 = F = 1. \tag{3.3}$$

Really, changing orientation, if necessary, we can make $F^3 > 0$. Then multiplying mollified operator by $F^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ both from the right and from the left and commuting it with P_j we will get operator of the same form with g^{jk}, V replaced by $F^{-1}g^{jk}$, $F^{-1}V$ respectively, modulo operator $h^2V'(x)$ where $V'(x)$ is a function, linear with respect to second derivatives of g^{jk} and F and thus V' does not exceed $C\bigl(1+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-2}\bigr)$; one can see easily that after multiplication by h^2 it does not exceed $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ which is an approximation error anyway (plus Ch^2 which is less than $C\mu^{-1}h$). Surely, such transformation would affect $e(x,x,0)$ but we will return to the original operator later.

In Chapter 6 of [Ivr1] on this step of reduction we applied $\mu^{-1}h$-FIO and let us try the same now. Namely, let us transform our operator by $T(1)$, where

$$T(t) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}tL^{\mathrm{w}}}, \qquad L^{\mathrm{w}} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jk} P_j L^{jk}(x) P_k \tag{3.4}$$

with $L^{jk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$. Obviously L^{w} is a Weyl $\mu^{-1}h$-quantization of

$$L(x,\xi) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu^2 \sum_{j,k} L^{jk}(x) p_j(x,\xi) p_k(x,\xi), \qquad p_j \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \xi_j - V_j(x). \tag{3.5}$$

In this subsection L, T, t do not denote the same things as everywhere else and $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ denotes space of functions functions satisfying

$$|\partial_{x,\xi}^{\nu} f| \le C_\nu \bigl(\varepsilon^{l-|\nu|}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + 1\bigr)$$

with the same constants C_ν as in [BrIvr].

Let us consider "Heisenberg evolution" $Q(t) = T(-t)\bar{Q}T(t)$ for $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo $\bar{Q}$; then

$$\partial_t Q(t) = i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}[L^{\mathrm{w}}, Q(t)], \qquad Q(0) = \bar{Q}. \tag{3.6}$$

Let us define first symbol $q(t)$ as a solution to

$$\partial_t q(t) = \{\mu^{-2}L, q\}, \qquad q(0) = \bar{q} \implies q(t) = \bar{q}\circ\phi_t \tag{3.7}$$

with standard Poison brackets where ϕ_t is a corresponding Hamiltonian flow. Let us consider differential equations defining Hamiltonian flow ϕ_t in terms of p_j and x_k:

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_j = \sum_k L^{jk}p_k, \qquad \frac{d}{dt}p_j = \sum_k \Lambda^{jk}p_k + \sum_{km}\beta_j^{km}p_kp_m \tag{3.8}$$

with $\Lambda \overset{\text{def}}{=} f(x)\ell J$, where $\Lambda = \bigl(\Lambda^{jk}\bigr)$, $\ell = \bigl(L^{jk}\bigr)$ and $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ are 2×2-matrices, here and below $\beta_* \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$, $f(x) = \partial_{x_1}V_2 - \partial_{x_2}V_1$.

One can see easily that for $|t|\le c$

$$|p|\le c \implies |p\circ\phi_t| \le C|p|, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\phi_t \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$p_j\circ\phi_t = e^{\Lambda(x)t}p + \sum_{j,k}\beta'_{jk}p_jp_k \qquad \text{on } \{|p|\le c\mu^{-1}\}, \tag{3.11}$$

$$x_j\circ\phi_t - x_j = \sum_j \beta''_{jk}p_k \tag{3.12}$$

where $p=(p_1,p_2)$, $x=(x_1,x_2)$.

Further, one can see easily that

$$a_0\circ\phi_t = \sum g_t^{jk}p_jp_k + M_t, \quad (g_t) = e^{t\Lambda(x)^T}(g)e^{t\Lambda(x)}, \qquad M_t = \sum_{i,j,k}\beta_{ijk;\,t}p_ip_jp_k \tag{3.13}$$

where $a_0 = \sum_{j,k} g^{jk}p_jp_k$ and (g), (g_t) denote corresponding matrices.

Now, let us consider in this region $\{|p|\le c\mu^{-1}\}$ third and higher derivatives of αp_jp_k with $\alpha_* \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$; then

$$|\partial^\nu_{x,\xi}(\alpha p_jp_k)| \le C_\nu \varepsilon^{-\nu+l}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\mu^{-2} + C \tag{3.14}$$

for $3\le\nu\le c|\log h|$ where C_ν are standard constants even if $V_j\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ only. Similarly for $\nu\ge 3$ we have

$$|\partial^\nu_{x,\xi}(\beta p_ip_jp_k)| \le C_\nu \varepsilon^{-\nu+\bar{l}-1}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\mu^{-3} + C; \tag{3.15}$$

so, $\mu^2M' \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}\bigcap \mu^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$.

Now let us pass from symbols to quantizations. I remind that $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})\succeq(2,0)$ and also that in the standard smooth situations and for a standard quantizations $[a^{\mathrm{w}},b^{\mathrm{w}}]=-ih\{a,b\}^{\mathrm{w}}+O(h^3)$; then for a standard quantization of $\mu^2a_0\circ\phi_t$ equation (3.6) will be fulfilled modulo operators with A-bound[22) not exceeding $C\mu^2(\mu^{-1}h)^2\times\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}\times(\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}+\varepsilon^{-2}\mu^{-3})$ which in turn does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h$.

Therefore, *transformed operator $T(-t)A_0T(t)$ differs from the quantization of the transformed symbol $\mu^2a_0\circ\phi_t$ by operator with A-bound not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h$.* I remind that A_0 is a Weyl $\mu^{-1}h$-quantization of a_0.

This is as good as we need.

Now we can pick up $L^{jk}\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ such that $e^{\Lambda^T}(g)e^{\Lambda}=\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&g^{-1}\end{pmatrix}$ with $g=\det(g)^{-1}$ because e^{Λ} could be any matrix with determinant equal to 1. Therefore we get that *modulo operator with A-bound not exceeding $\mu^{-1}h$*

$$T(-1)A_0T(1)\equiv P_1^2+P_2(g^{-1})^{\mathrm{W}}P_2+\mu^2M^{\mathrm{W}},\tag{3.17}$$

$$M\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}a_0\circ\phi_1-p_1^2-g^{-1}p_2^2,\quad g'\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}g\circ\phi_1.\tag{3.18}$$

I remind that according to (3.13) $M=\sum_{i,j,k}\beta_{ijk}p_ip_jp_k$ with $\beta_{ijk}\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$.

Consider now transformation of V. Note that

$$|\partial^\nu_{x,\xi}(V\circ\phi_t)|\le C_\nu\varepsilon^{l-\nu}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$$

in the same region $\{|p|\le c\mu^{-1}\}$. Then one can see easily that modulo operator with A-bound not exceeding $C(\mu^{-1}h)^2\times\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}\times\varepsilon^{l-3}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ (which is obviously less than $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$)

$$T(-1)VT(1)\equiv(V\circ\phi_1)^{\mathrm{W}}.\tag{3.19}$$

Also note that we used only that $V_1,V_2\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$. Therefore without any loss of generality one can assume that

$$V_1=0,\quad P_1=hD_1,\quad V_2,\partial_{x_1}V_2=g^{-\frac{1}{2}}\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}\tag{3.20}$$

where the third assertion follows from the first and the second ones and

$$p_2=\alpha(x,\xi_2)\bigl(x_1-\lambda(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr),\qquad\alpha,\lambda\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}.\tag{3.21}$$

---

22) We say that A bound of B is R if

$$\|Bu\|\le R\bigl(\|u\|+\|A^mu\|\bigr)\tag{3.16}$$

with some exponent m which is fixed in advance.

3.2 Canonical form. Main part of operator. II

In this subsection we will reduce A_0 to canonical form which is really easy for constant g^{jk} and F.

Our next transformation is $T'(t) = e^{-i\lambda^{\rm w} D_1}$ with $\lambda^{\rm w} = \lambda^{\rm w}(x_2, \mu^{-1}hD_2)$; then

$$T'(-t)D_1T'(t) = D_1, \quad T'(-t)\lambda^{\rm w}T'(t) = \lambda^{\rm w}, \quad T'(-t)x_1T'(t) = x_1 + \lambda^{\rm w} \tag{3.22}$$

precisely.

To calculate transformations of other operators we need to introduce the corresponding Hamiltonian flow ϕ'_t:

$$\xi_1 = \text{const},\ \lambda(x_2,\xi_2) = \text{const},\ x_1 = x_1(0) + t\lambda(x_2,\xi_2), \tag{3.23}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_2 = \xi_1\bigl(\partial_{\xi_2}\lambda(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr), \qquad \frac{d}{dt}\xi_2 = -\xi_1\bigl(\partial_{x_2}\lambda(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr). \tag{3.24}$$

This flow is less regular than ϕ_t:

$$|\partial^\nu_{x,\xi}\phi'_t| \le C_\alpha\mu^{-1}\bigl(1 + \varepsilon^{\bar{l}-1-\nu|}|\log\mu|^{-\bar\sigma}\bigr). \tag{3.25}$$

However, using again above arguments we can estimate the difference between operators $T'(-1)\alpha^{\rm w}T'(1)$ and $(\alpha\circ\phi'_1)^{\rm w}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar\sigma}$: its A-bound does not exceed $(\mu^{-1}h)^2\times\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}\times\varepsilon^{-2}\mu^{-1}$ which in turn does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h$. The same statement is true for $\mu^{-1}\beta^{\rm w}$ with $\beta\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar\sigma}$.

Therefore, *modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h$*

$$T'(-1)T(-1)A_0T(1)T'(1) \equiv \bar{A}_0 + \mu^2(M')^{\rm w}, \tag{3.26}$$

$$\bar{A}_0 \overset{\rm def}{=} \bar{P}_1^2 + \bar{P}_2^2, \quad \bar{P}_1 = hD_1, \bar{P}_2 = -\mu x_1, \tag{3.27}$$

$$M' = a_0\circ\Phi - \bar{a}_0 = \sum_{i,j,k}\beta'_{ijk}\bar{p}_i\bar{p}_j\bar{p}_k \tag{3.28}$$

with $\bar{p}_1 \overset{\rm def}{=} \xi_1$, $\bar{p}_2 \overset{\rm def}{=} -x_1$, $\Phi \overset{\rm def}{=} \phi_1\circ\phi'_1$.

Similarly, *modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$*

$$T'(-1)T(-1)VT(1)T'(1) \equiv (V\circ\Phi)^{\rm w}. \tag{3.29}$$

3.3 Canonical form. Potential

Now we have $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo $\bar{A}$, with the symbol $\mu^2\bar{a}_0 = \mu^2(x_1^2+\xi_1^2)$, perturbed by $\mu^2(M')^{\rm w}$ and $(V')^{\rm w}$ with $V' = (V\circ\Phi)^{\rm w}$. The first perturbing operator would vanish for constant g^{jk}

and F but the second one would still cause trouble because it's symbol depends on x_1,ξ_1 as well[23]. Our goal is to make a perturbation a $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with the symbol depending on x_2,ξ_2, and $r^2\overset{\text{def}}{=}x_1^2+\xi_1^2$ only.

Let us consider the smooth case first as a pilot model; then we can decompose $V\circ\Phi$ in asymptotic series with respect to x_1,ξ_1. To get rid of linear terms we need to make a shift in x_1,ξ_1 of a magnitude μ^{-2}; then the increment of $\mu^2\bar{a}_0$ will absorb these terms. We can continue further [24] but what we need really is an error in magnetic Weyl expression not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)h^{-2}$. In 3-dimensional case we will need much less than this (an error in operator $O(\mu^{-2})$ will be almost sufficiently small) but now we should request $O(\mu^{-1}h)$ error which can be as large as $O(\mu^{-4})$ now and to run things in a "smooth" manner we would need $l=4$ while our objective is to get the best estimate as $l=2$ [25].

Let us return to the non-smooth case and try to repeat above arguments. To make the shift described above we need to use transformation $T''(-t)=e^{-it\mu h^{-1}S^{\mathrm{w}}}$ with $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo S^{w} with the symbol belonging to $\mu^{-2}\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$; to accommodate M' we will need to add $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with symbol satisfying improved estimate (3.15). Namely, one can see easily that

$$|\partial_{x,\xi}^{\nu}M'|\le C_\nu\varepsilon^{-\nu+1}|\log h|^{-1}\mu^{-3}+C\mu^{(-3+\nu_1)_-}\tag{3.30}$$

with ν_1 counting derivatives with respect to (x_1,ξ_1) only.

So in fact

$$S=S'+S'',\quad S'\in\mu^{-2}\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma},\qquad S''\in\mu^{-2}\mathcal{F}^{1,0}\tag{3.31}$$

and S'' satisfies (3.30); some adjustments to be done later.

Remark 3.1. One can check easily that such operator $T''(t)$ would be $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo iff

$$\mu\ge\bar{\mu}_1^*\overset{\text{def}}{=}Ch^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{\frac13}.\tag{3.32}$$

It is much simpler to analyze transformation by $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos than by $\mu^{-1}h$-FIOs with not very regular symbols and one can avoid some hassle if (3.32) holds. This restriction is not smoothness related: one just need to take away from $\mu^2M'+V'$ a term of magnitude μ^{-1}.

---

[23] In this case Φ is a linear symplectomorphism.

[24] We cannot eliminate terms of even degrees $2m$ completely, but we can reduce them to $\mu^2\omega_m(x_2,\xi_2)(x_1^2+\xi_1^2)^m$; see Chapter 6 of [Ivr1].

[25] Actually we need $l=3$ because the "weak magnetic field" approach leads to $O\bigl(h^{-2}(\mu h|\log h|)^l\bigr)$ error and "strong magnetic field" approach in the discussed above smooth version produces $O\bigl(h^{-2}\mu^{-l}\bigr)$ error; threshold is as $\mu=h^{-\frac12}|\log h|^{-\frac12}$ and to keep error below $\mu^{-1}h$ we need $l=3$ and $\sigma=\frac32$ and I will proceed in this assumption in my next paper [Ivr6] devoted to higher dimensions.

One can cover case $\mu \le \bar{\mu}_1^*$ by results of the previous section; this would require $l = \bar{l} = 2$, $\sigma = \bar{\sigma} = 3$ to achieve the best possible estimate $O(\mu^{-1}h)$.

However I will use more sophisticated arguments to cover $\mu \in [\bar{\mu}_1, \bar{\mu}_1^*]$ here and prove the best possible estimate for $\sigma = \bar{\sigma} = 1$ instead.

Let us consider corresponding Hamiltonian flow ψ_t. One can see easily that

$$|\partial_{x,\xi}^{\nu}(\psi_t - I)| \le C_\nu \mu^{-2}\varepsilon^{l-1-\nu}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + C_\nu \mu^{-3}\varepsilon^{-\nu} \tag{3.33}$$

where I is an identity map.

Using arguments of the previous subsection one can prove easily that $T''(-t)\bar{P}_j T''(t) \equiv \mu(\bar{p}_j \circ \psi_t)^{\mathrm{w}}$ modulo operator with the upper $\bar{A}_0$-bound

$$\mu(\mu^{-1}h)^2 \times \bigl(1 + \mu^{-2}\varepsilon^{l-3}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + \mu^{-3}\varepsilon^{-2}|\log h|^{-1}\bigr)\times \\ \bigl(\mu^{-2}\varepsilon^{l-4}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + \mu^{-3}\varepsilon^{-3}|\log h|^{-1}\bigr); \tag{3.34}$$

then the same is true for $T''(-t)\bar{A}_0T''(t) \equiv \mu^2(\bar{a}_0\circ\psi_t)^{\mathrm{w}}$. The bad news is that this expression is not necessarily less than $C\mu^{-1}h$ even if $l = 2$, $\sigma = 1$; the trouble appears as μ is close to $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ in which case expression (3.34) is close to h. Also, expression (3.34) is not less than $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ for $l < \frac{3}{2}$ and μ close to $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ again.

We could avoid these problems by slightly increasing $\bar{l}$ and assuming that $l \ge \frac{3}{2}$ but there is a better way. Note that (3.33) with ε replaced by $\bar{\epsilon} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu^{-1-\delta}$ with small enough $\delta > 0$ is less than $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h + \vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ (with original ε in the last expression). Then let us assume that

(3.35) $S' \in \mu^{-2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{l,\sigma}$ and S'' satisfies (3.30) with ε replaced by $\bar{\varepsilon} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu^{-1-\delta}$; here and below $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^*$ means that in the definition of the class ε replaced by $\bar{\varepsilon}$ while $\mathcal{F}^*$ denotes the original class.

The same arguments show that $T''(-t)(\mu^2M' + V')^{\mathrm{w}}T''(t) \equiv \bigl((\mu^2M' + V')\circ\psi_t\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$ with the same error. So, modulo operator with A-bound not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h + \vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ we need to consider the quantization of

$$\bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + \mu^2M' + V'\bigr)\circ\psi_1. \tag{3.36}$$

One can see easily that $\bar{p}_j\circ\psi_t - \bar{p}_j - t\{\bar{p}_j, S' + S''\} \in \mu^{-4}\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{l-2,\sigma}$ and therefore

$$\mu^2\bigl(\bar{a}_0\circ\psi_t - t\bar{a}_0 - \{\bar{a}_0, S' + S''\}\bigr) \in \mu^{-2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{l-1,\sigma}$$

and if $V' \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{l,\sigma}$ and M' satisfied (3.30) with ε replaced by $\bar{\varepsilon}$ then $(\mu^2M' + V')\circ\psi_t - (\mu^2M' + V')$ would belong to the same class. In this case "the main part" of (3.36) would be $\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0,S'+S''\}+\mu^2M'+V'$ and we would define S',S'' from equations

$$\{\bar{a}_0,S'\}=-\mu^{-2}(V'-W'),\tag{3.37}$$

$$\{\bar{a}_0,S''\}=-(M'-\mu^{-2}W'').\tag{3.38}$$

Since $\{\bar{a}_0,q\}=(\xi_1\partial_{x_1}-x_1\partial_{\xi_1})q$ these equations would be solvable and solutions would satisfy (3.35) if and only if

$$W'(x_2,\xi_2,r)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int V'(r\cos t,r\sin t;x_2,\xi_2)\,dt,\tag{3.39}$$

$$W''(x_2,\xi_2,r)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu^2\int M'(r\cos t,r\sin t;x_2,\xi_2)\,dt;\tag{3.40}$$

where I remind $r^2=x_1^2+\xi_1^2$.

One can calculate easily the difference between $\bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\mu^2M'+V'\bigr)\circ\psi_1$ and $\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0,S'+S''\}+\mu^2M'+V'$; it will be $O(\mu^{-2})$ which is small enough to be taken care of by $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo transformations in what follows. More precisely

$$N\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\Bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\mu^2M'+V'\Bigr)\circ\psi_1-\\ \Bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0,S'+S''\}+\mu^2M'+V'\Bigr)\in\mu^{-2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{l-1,\sigma}.\tag{3.41}$$

Since our symbols belong to $\mathcal{F}^*$ rather than $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^*$, we just replace V',M' by their $\bar{\varepsilon}$-mollifications $\bar{V}',\bar{M}'$ and define $\bar{S}',\bar{S}'',\bar{W}',\bar{W}''$ by (3.37)-(3.40) with $\bar{V}',\bar{M}'$ instead of V',M'.

Then we have unaccounted term K^{w} in the operator *before* the last transformation with $K=(\mu^2\tilde{M}'+\tilde{V}')$, $\tilde{M}'=M'-\bar{M}'$, $\tilde{V}'=V'-\bar{V}'$ and then $K\in\vartheta(\bar{\varepsilon})\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ and it also belongs to the same class as $V'+\mu^2M'$ did.

To finish this part we need to understand how operator K^{w} is transformed by $T''(1)$. One can see easily that $K=K_0+K_1+\dots+K_m$ where K_j is the difference between ε_j and ε_{j+1}-mollifications, $\varepsilon_j=2^j\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_m=\bar{\varepsilon}$. Obviously $K_j\in\vartheta(\varepsilon_j)\mathcal{F}_j^{0,0}$ where $\mathcal{F}_j^*$ denotes corresponding class with ε replaced by ε_j.

Then one can see easily that $T''(-1)K_j^{\mathrm{w}}T''(1)\equiv K_j^{\mathrm{w}}$ modulo operator with the norm not exceeding $\mu^{-2}\varepsilon_j^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ and then $T''(-1)K^{\mathrm{w}}T''(1)\equiv K^{\mathrm{w}}$ modulo operator with the norm not exceeding $\mu^{-2}\varepsilon^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ as $l<2$ or $\mu^{-2}|\log h|^{1-\sigma}$ as $l=2$ and in both cases we got $O\bigl(\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ estimate unless $l=2,\mu\le\bar{\mu}_1^*$.

The similar calculations show that for $l=2$ and $\mu\in[\bar{\mu}_1,\bar{\mu}_1^*]$
$T''(-1)K^{\mathrm{w}}T''(1)\equiv(K')^{\mathrm{w}}$ modulo operator with the norm not exceeding $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ with $K'=K+\{K,\bar{S}'+\bar{S}''\}$.

3.4 Canonical form. End of reduction

Thus we arrived to operator $\bar{A}_0+\bar{W}^{\mathrm{w}}+(L+K')^{\mathrm{w}}$ where $\bar{W}=W'+W''$, L is defined by (3.41) and

$$K'=\sum_{0\le j\le m} K_j,\qquad K_j\in \vartheta(\varepsilon_j)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}_j\subset \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}_j. \tag{3.42}$$

Fortunately, both L and K' are small enough to be reduced by $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo.

Namely, let us consider transformation by $U=\bigl(e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}(S'''+S^{IV}}\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$ where S''' and S^{IV} are symbols of the same class as L and K respectively; in particular, S^{IV} admits decomposition of type (3.42).

One can check easily that $e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}(S'''+S^{IV})}\in\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ as long as $\mu^{-l}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\le C\varepsilon^{-1}$ which is always the case because $\mu\ge Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and $(l,\sigma)\succeq(1,2)$. One can see easily that modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$

$$U^{-1}\Bigl(\bar{A}_0+\bigl(\bar{W}+K'+L\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}\Bigr)U\equiv \bar{A}_0+\bigl(\{\bar{a}_0,S'''+S^{IV}\}+\bar{W}+K+L+R\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{3.43}$$

where *one needs to include $R\in\mu^{-4}\mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$ only for $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$.*

Now we need just to define S''',S^{IV},W''',W^{IV} from equations similar to (3.37)-(3.40):

$$\{\bar{a}_0,S'''\}=-(L-W'''), \tag{3.44}$$

$$\{\bar{a}_0,S^{IV}\}=-(K'-W^{IV}), \tag{3.45}$$

$$W'''(x_2,\xi_2,r)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int L(r\cos t,r\sin t;x_2,\xi_2)\,dt, \tag{3.46}$$

$$W^{IV}(x_2,\xi_2,r)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int K'(r\cos t,r\sin t;x_2,\xi_2)\,dt. \tag{3.47}$$

So, *modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)+\mu^{-4}\bigr)$ we reduced A to $\bar{A}_0+W^{\mathrm{w}}$ where $W=\bar{W}+W''+W'''$ depends on x_2,ξ_2,r only.*

This is almost the end of the story: for $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ and $\mu\in[\bar{\mu}_1,h^{-\frac{1}{3}}]$ one needs to make one step more: namely, there is operator R^{w} in the right-hand expression of (3.43) and we should make transformation $U'=\bigl(e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}S^{V}}\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$ with $S^{V}\in\mu^{-4}\mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$ defined by

$$\{\bar{a}_0,S'''\}=-(R-W^{V}), \tag{3.48}$$

$$W^{V}(x_2,\xi_2,r)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int R(r\cos t,r\sin t;x_2,\xi_2)\,dt. \tag{3.49}$$

So, *modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ we reduced A to $\bar{A}_0+W^{\mathrm{w}}$ where for $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ one needs to include W^{V} into W as well.*

3.5 Canonical form. Calculations. I

Now we will need to calculate W more explicitly. To do this we repeat our construction, paying attention to explicit expressions we get rather than their smoothness. Also we will consider Weyl symbols rather than operators semselves. Let us start from the beginning of subsection 3.3. We started from symbol $\mu^2\bar{a}_0+b$ with $b=\mu^2M'+V'$. Then we applied ψ_1 transformation and arrived to

$$\begin{aligned}(\mu^2\bar{a}_0+b)\circ\psi_1 =&\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\\ &\mu^2\{\bar{S},\bar{a}_0\}+\qquad \frac{1}{2}\mu^2\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},\bar{a}_0\}\}+\frac{1}{6}\mu^2\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},\bar{a}_0\}\}\}+\\ &b\qquad +\qquad \{\bar{S},b\}\qquad +\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},b\}\}\qquad +\dots\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

where $\bar{S}=\bar{S}'+\bar{S}''$ and we skipped terms not exceeding $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$. Plugging $\mu^2\{\bar{S},\bar{a}_0\}=-\bar{b}+\bar{W}_0$ where $\bar{b}$ is a $\bar{\varepsilon}$-mollification of b and

$$\bar{W}_0=\mathcal{M}_r\bar{b}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} b(r\cos t, r\sin t; x_2,\xi_2)\,dt, \tag{3.51}$$

we get $\mu^2\bar{a}_0+\bar{W}_0+b_1$ with

$$b_1=\frac{1}{2}\{\bar{S},-\bar{b}+\bar{W}_0\}+(b-\bar{b})+\{\bar{S},b\}+\frac{1}{6}\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},-\bar{b}+\bar{W}_0\}\}+\frac{1}{2}\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},b\}\} \tag{3.52}$$

as a result of subsection 3.3. To calculate W as a result subsection 3.4 (without the last step) we need to apply $\mathcal{M}_r$ to this expression:

$$\begin{aligned}W=\bar{W}_0+(\mathcal{M}_rb)_1=(\mathcal{M}_rb)+&\\ \mathcal{M}_r\ \{\bar{S},-\frac{1}{2}\bar{b}+\frac{1}{2}\bar{W}_0+b\}&+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}_r\{\bar{S},\{\bar{S},-\frac{1}{3}\bar{b}+\frac{1}{3}\bar{W}_0+b\}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

Finally, if $l=2$, $\sigma>0$ and we want to eliminate $O(\mu^{-4})$ from an error, we need to make a last step and define S_1 from equation $\mu^2\{S_1,\bar{a}_0\}=-b_1+(W-\bar{W}_0)$, calculate

$$\begin{aligned}b_2=&\frac{1}{2}\mu^2\{S_1,\{S_1,\bar{a}_0\}\}+\{S_1,\bar{W}_0\}+b_1-(W-\bar{W}_0)=\\ &\{S_1,-\frac{1}{2}b_1+\frac{1}{2}W+\frac{1}{2}\bar{W}_0\}+b_1-(W-\bar{W}_0)\end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

and add to W term $\mathcal{M}_rb_2$.

Let $W_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{M}_r b$, $b' = \frac{1}{2}\bar{W}_0 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{b} + b$. Then

$$\partial_\phi \bar{S} = \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-2}\bar{\beta}, \qquad \text{with} \quad \beta = b - W_0, \quad \bar{\beta} = \bar{b} - \bar{W}_0. \tag{3.55}$$

One can see easily that $W_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ and that $W_0 \equiv b \ (\mod O\bigl(\vartheta(\bar{\varepsilon}) + \mu^{-2}\bigr)\bigr)$.

Note that we can take $\bar{S} = 0$ as $x_1 = \xi_1 = 0$ and in this case

$$|\partial_{x_2,\xi_2}\bar{S}| \le C\mu^{-2}\bigl(\mu^{-1} + \bar{\varepsilon}^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}\bigr). \tag{3.56}$$

One can check easily that with the final error $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ in all the above calculations one can replace standard Poisson brackets $\{.,.\}$ by "short" ones $\{.,.\}'$, involving only x_1, ξ_1, which in polar coordinates (r,ϕ) at (x_1,ξ_1)-plane are $\{f,g\}' = r^{-1}\bigl((\partial_\phi f)\cdot(\partial_r g) - (\partial_\phi g)\cdot(\partial_r f)\bigr)$. Then integrating by parts if b' is differentiated by ϕ we get easily that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_r\{\bar{S}, b'\}' = r^{-1}\partial_r\mathcal{M}_r(b'\partial_\phi\bar{S}) = \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-2}r^{-1}\partial_r\mathcal{M}_r\bigl(b'\bar{\beta}\bigr) \equiv \\ W_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4}\mu^{-2}r^{-1}\partial_r\mathcal{M}_r\bigl((W_0-b)^2\bigr).\end{aligned} \tag{3.57}$$

Further, for $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ let us consider the last terms in (3.51) and $\mathcal{M}_r b_2$ [26]. One can see easily that only "short" Poisson brackets should be considered. Then using the same arguments as above one can prove easily that modulo $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h + \vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ these terms are equal $\frac{1}{8}\mu^{-4}r^{-1}\partial_r\mathcal{M}_r\bigl(r^{-1}(b - W_0)^2 W\bigr)$ and $\frac{1}{4}\mu^{-2}r^{-1}\partial_r\mathcal{M}_r\bigl((b_1 - W_1)^2\bigr)$ respectively with b_1 *redefined as*

$$b_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\{S, b + W_0\}, \quad W_1 = \mathcal{M}_r b_1. \tag{3.52*}$$

3.6 Canonical form. Calculations. II

Now we want more explicit expressions for W, W_1 via g^{jk}, V.

First of all, note that for constant metrics g^{jk} we have $b = V' = V \circ \Phi$, where $\Phi : T^*\mathbb{R}^2 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^2$ is a linear map. Then $W_0 = \mathcal{M}_r V'$ and since under map Φ circle $\mathcal{C}_r = \{(x_2,\xi_2) = \text{const}, x_1 = r\cos t, \xi_1 = r\sin t\}$ translates into ellipse with x-projection $\mathcal{E}_r(y) = \{\sum_{j,k} g_{jk}(x_j - y_j)(x_k - y_k) = r^2\}$ where $y = \Phi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{\xi}_2)$ is its center and g_{jk} are elements of inverse matrix $(g^{jk})^{-1}$, we get that W_0 is $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{E}_r}(\Phi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{\xi}_2))$ which is a corresponding average of V along $\mathcal{E}_r(y)$.

---

[26] One can prove easily that they are not essential for $(l,\sigma) \preceq (2,0)$ and we will see that they are $\asymp \mu^{-4}$ $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$.

Similarly, we see that $W_1 \equiv -\frac{1}{4}\mu^{-2}|\nabla V'|^2 \equiv -\frac{1}{4}\mu^{-2}\sum g^{jk}(\partial_{x_j}V)(\partial_{x_k}V)\circ\Phi$ modulo $O(\mu^{-4})$.

In the general case, the deviation of $\mathcal{C}_r \circ \Phi$ from ellipse $\mathcal{E}_r$ (with g_{jk} calculated in the center) is $O(\mu^{-2})$ and thus $W \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{E}_r}(\Phi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{\xi}_2))$ modulo $O(\mu^{-2})$. This does not require $l > 1$. It would be nice to get more precise answer in the general case as well.

3.7 Canonical form: $\mu \ge C_0^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$

In this case we cannot claim anymore that $|p_j| \le C\mu^{-1}$ in the microlocal sense even if $\mu \le ch^{-1}$ because $f\bigl(\mu p_1(x,\xi), \mu p_2 x,\xi), x\bigr)$ is no more quantizable symbol. However, now $\mu^{-1} \le \varepsilon$ and $f\bigl(\varepsilon^{-1}p_1(x,\xi), \varepsilon^{-1}p_2(x,\xi), x\bigr)$ is quantizable symbol and we can claim that $|p_j| \le C\varepsilon$ in the microlocal sense in the zone of $\tau \le c + c\mu h$ due to ellipticity arguments. Basically, this makes our construction much simpler; however, we need to remember that h^2 is no more non-essential term.

Construction of subsections 3.1, 3.2 remains the same but we need to take in account correction $h^2 F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{jk} \partial_j (g^{jk}\partial_k F^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ appearing when multiplying A by $F^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from the left and right and moving both copies of $F^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ to g^{jk}. This correction is the second term in (0.?).

Further, since the principal part of operator A is of magnitude μh rather than of magnitude 1 as it was before, the approximation error is $O\bigl(\mu h\varepsilon^{\bar{l}}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\bigr)$ and it is non-essential (i.e. $O(\mu^{-1}h)$) for $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (4, 2)$ only.

In the very input of subsection 3.2 we can take a Taylor decomposition with respect to (x_1, ξ_1) (as we did in the smooth case) and then modulo "non-essential symbol" (which belongs to $\bigl(\mu^{-1}h + \vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mu^2(x_1^2 + \xi_1^2) + V(x_2, \xi_2) + \\
&\mu^2 \sum_{j=0}^{3} \beta_j(x_2, \xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{3-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{1} \alpha_j(x_2, \xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{1-j} + \\
&\mu^2 \sum_{j=0}^{4} \beta'_j(x_2, \xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{4-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{2} \alpha'_j(x_2, \xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{2-j}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.58}
$$

with $\beta_j \in \mathcal{F}^{1,1}$, $\beta_j \in \mathcal{F}^{0,1}$, $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$, $\beta_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$ and we need the last term only if $l \ge 2$.

However, we need to remember the terms in decomposition of the main part; we can eliminate the third-order term but we will reduce the fourth-order term. More precisely, to get rid of the third and the forth terms in (3.58) we use again the construction of subsection

3.3 but we look explicitly for

$$S' = \sum_{j=0}^{1} \hat{\alpha}_j(x_2,\xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{1-j}, \qquad S'' = \mu^2 \sum_{j=0}^{3} \hat{\beta}_j(x_2,\xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{3-j} \tag{3.59}$$

with $\hat{\alpha}_j, \hat{\beta}_j$ of the same regularity as α_j, β_j.

Now we have expression (3.58) without the third and the fourth terms; the fifth and the sixth terms are modified but retain $\mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$-regularity provided $l = 2, \sigma > 0$; for $l < 2$ and $l = 2, \sigma \le 0$ we get non-essential term. For $\mu \ge c^{-1}h^{-1}$ these terms are non-essential as well. So, in these two cases our construction is complete.

To complete reduction for $\mu \in [h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}, ch^{-1}]$, $l = 2$, $\sigma > 0$ we apply again "poor man FIO", this time with

$$S' = \sum_{j=0}^{2} \hat{\alpha}'_j(x_2,\xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{2-j}, \qquad S'' = \mu^2 \sum_{j=0}^{4} \hat{\beta}'_j(x_2,\xi_2) x_1^j \xi_1^{4-j} \tag{3.60}$$

with $\hat{\alpha}'_j, \hat{\beta}'_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$. However, we cannot eliminate these terms completely, we can only to reduce them to

$$\bar{\beta}(x_2,\xi_2)(x_1^2 + \xi_1^2), \quad \bar{\alpha}(x_2,\xi_2)(x_1^2+\xi_1^2)^2$$

respectively with $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$.

One can calculate easily that the final expression is resembling one from subsection 3.5 because in our situation $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}} f = f + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-2}\Delta_{x_1,\xi_1} f$ modulo non-essential term and one can recalculate this way W_1 too. However, construction here reminds one of the smooth theory.

So, we have proven

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\mu \ge h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. *Then modulo operator with* $\bar{A}_0$*-bound not exceeding* $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h + \vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ *one can reduce operator* A *to operator* $\bar{A}_0 + W^{\mathrm{w}}$ *where* $W = W_0 + W_1 + W_2$ *depends on* x_2, ξ_2 *and* $\mu^{-1}A_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ *only.*

4 $d = 2$: Proof of Theorem 0.1

Now our purpose is to prove statements (ii),(ii) of theorem 0.1.

4.1 Decomposition

We again consider more difficult case $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ first; the opposite case can be considered in the same way with obvious modifications and simplifications.

There is very little what is left: removing non-essential operator and compensating this by adding $\mp C_0\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ to the lower/upper approximation (which in turn will not violate our estimates; see below), we get a 1-dimensional operator-valued $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo $\bar{A}_0 + W(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2,\mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0)$. with operator-valued symbol, acting in auxiliary space $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Taking decomposition into $\Upsilon_n(x_1)\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}(\mu^{-1}h)^{-\frac{1}{4}}\upsilon_n\bigl((\mu^{-1}h)^{-\frac{1}{2}}x_1\bigr)$ with Hermitian functions υ_n and coefficients which are functions of x_2 we get a family of 1-dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos

$$\mathcal{A}_n = r_n^2 + W(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2,\mu^{-1}r_n),\qquad r_n=\bigl((2n+1)\mu h\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{4.1}$$

as $\mu hn\le C_0$.

Even if we cannot apply directly spectral projectors associated with $\mathcal{A}_n$ we can consider propagator $e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde{A}}$ and its Schwartz kernel $u(x,y,t)$ and prove easily that for $t, |t|\le T_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\epsilon\mu$

$$u(x,y,t)\equiv \mathcal{T}\Bigl(\sum_{n\ge 0}u_n(x_2,y_2,t)\Upsilon_n(x_1)\Upsilon_n(y_1)\Bigr)\mathcal{T}^{-1} \tag{4.2}$$

modulo Schwartz kernel of an operator which becomes negligible multiplied by $\bigl(\psi(x)q(\mu p_1,\mu p_2)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$ where ψ, q are smooth and supported in $B(0,\frac{1}{2})$ and $B(0,C_0)$ respectively; we call operator *negligible* if its norm does not exceed $C(\mu^{-1}h)^s$ with large enough exponent s.

Here u is the Schwartz kernel of the propagator $e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde{A}}$ of the transformed back reduced operator $\tilde{A}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\mathcal{T}\Bigl(\bar{A}_0+W(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2,\mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0)\Bigr)\mathcal{T}^{-1}$ [27] which is 1-dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with operator-valued symbol[28], $\mathcal{T}$ is a full transformation constructed in subsections 3.1, 3.2, u_n are Schwartz kernels of the propagators $e^{ih^{-1}t\mathcal{A}_n}$ for $\mathcal{A}_n$. Further, by definition $W=W_0+W_1$ because W_2 is not essential in our sense.

4.2 Remainder estimate

So, for $T=T_1$, $\tau\le c$

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\psi(x)u(x,y,t)\bigr)\Bigr)\equiv F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\chi_T(t)\sum_{n\ge 0}\Gamma\Bigl(\tilde{\psi}\bigl(u_n(x_2,y_2,t)\Upsilon_n(x_1)\Upsilon_n(y_1)\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigr) \tag{4.3}$$

---

[27] Apart of just reduction we removed some "non-essential" terms.

[28] Actually we have two of them: $\tilde{A}^\pm$ such that $\tilde{A}^-\le A\le\tilde{A}^+$ and A-bounds of operators $A-\tilde{A}^\pm$ do not exceed $C\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$ (so they are operators described in footnote [10]).

modulo $O(\mu^{-s})$ where as before Γ is a trace for Schwartz kernel (restriction to the diagonal and integration) and $\tilde{\psi}=\mathcal{T}^{-1}\psi\mathcal{T}$ is $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo rather than a function; its symbol is not very regular (see below).

In this decomposition we can consider only $n\le C(\mu h)^{-1}$ because for any other n interval $(-\infty,C_0)$ is a classically forbidden zone for operator $\mathcal{A}_n$ and one can prove easily that their contributions do not exceed $C\mu^{-s}(\mu hn+1)^{-s}$ with the arbitrarily large s and thus their total contribution is negligible.

Note that all operators $\mathcal{A}_n$ are non-degenerate (microhyperbolic) at level 0 in the sense that

$$|\mathcal{A}_n|+|\nabla_{x_2,\xi_2}\mathcal{A}_n|\ge\epsilon_0 \tag{4.4}$$

if and only if the original operator was: $|\nabla_x(V/F)|\ge\epsilon_0$ because $|\nabla(W-V/F)|\le C\mu^{-1}$. We assumed that this non-degeneracy condition holds and then in the standard way we can prove that if $Q_x=q(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_{x_2})$ and $Q'_y=q'(y_2,\mu^{-1}hD_{y_2})$ are $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos with symbols supported in ε-vicinity of $(\bar{x}_2,\bar{\xi}_2)$ in which condition (4.4) is fulfilled, then $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(Q_xQ'_yu_n(x_2,y_2,t)\bigr)$ is negligible provided $T\le T_1$ and $\mu^{-1}T\times\varepsilon\ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$ or

$$T_0\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|\le T\le T_1=\epsilon\mu; \tag{4.5}$$

I remind that χ is an admissible function supported in $[-1,-\frac{1}{2}]\cup[\frac{1}{2},1]$. Then $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\psi(x)u(x$ is negligible as well.

This statement does not look strong enough because T_0 seems to be much larger than we need: the direct assault shows that $|\Gamma\psi Ku|$ does not exceed Ch^{-2} (where $K=k\bigl(x,\mu p(x,\xi)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$) is $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo cut-off; then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(\psi Ku)\bigr)|\le Ch^{-2}T_0 \tag{4.6}$$

for $\bar{\chi}$ supported in $[-1,1]$ and equal 1 at $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$ and $T\in[T_0,T_1]$; here we can take $K=I$ because $\tau\le c$ and we can apply ellipticity arguments in zone $\{|p|\ge C'\mu^{-1}\}$; then (4.6) and the standard Tauberian arguments imply spectral remainder estimate

$$|\Gamma(\psi Q_xe)(\tau)-h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(\psi Qu)\bigr)\Bigr)d\tau'|\le Ch^{-2}\frac{T_0}{T_1} \tag{4.7}$$

which is equal to $Ch^{-1}\mu^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}|\log h|$ and it is close to what we are looking for (but still is not that good) only for $l=1$. The source of this trouble is that we have ε-scale in both x_2 and ξ_2, while in the differential case treated in [BrIvr] we had scale 1 in ξ_2.

However, there is a way to improve our analysis: what we need is an estimate

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\bigr)|\le Ch^{-1}+C\mu h^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon) \tag{4.8}$$

which I am going to prove; then dividing the right-hand expression of (4.8) by T_1 we get the required remainder estimate $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+h^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$.

First of all, I want to deal with u_n directly. Note that

$$\tilde\psi=\psi_0(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)+\psi_1(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)x_1+\psi_2(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)\mu^{-1}hD_1+\tilde\psi'(x,\mu^{-1}hD)$$

with symbol of $\tilde\psi'$ belonging to $\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$; for $l=2,\sigma>0$ one needs to include second order terms

$$\psi_{11}(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)x_1^2+\psi_{12}(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)(x_1\mu^{-1}hD_1+\mu^{-1}hD_1x_1)+\\ \psi_{11}(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)(\mu^{-1}hD_1)^2$$

as well.

Let us consider $|F_{t\mapsto h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\tilde\psi' u\bigr)|$ first; due to analysis above it does not exceed $Ch^{-2}T_0\times\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$; one can see easily that it does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.8).

Plugging terms linear with respect to $(x_1,\mu^{-1}hD_1)$ kills trace while plugging quadratic terms is equivalent to plugging $(n+\frac{1}{2})\mu^{-1}h\psi'(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)$ with $\psi'=\psi_{11}+\psi_{22}$.

Now we have pure $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos, acting on x_2 alone; we consider u_n and replace Γ by Γ' acting with respect to x_2 alone.

Second, we need to improve T_0 slightly, removing $|\log h|$ factor and to get better estimates for Fourier transform. Let us consider ε-admissible partition in (x_2,ξ_2): $1=\sum_\nu q_{(\nu)}$ and consider element $q_{(\nu)}$ of this partition. Note that for time $|t|\le T_0$ function $q^{\mathrm{w}}_{(\nu)}(y_2,\mu^{-1}hD_{y_2})u$ is negligible outside $C_1\varepsilon$-vicinity $\mathcal{U}_{(\nu)}$ of $(\bar x_{(\nu)2},\bar\xi_{(\nu)2})\in\operatorname{supp}q_{(\nu)}$.

One can easily prove by the standard rescaling technique (see [Ivr5]) the following estimate

$$|\Gamma'\bigl(\chi_T(t)q_{(\nu)}u_n\bigr)|\le C\varepsilon^2\mu h^{-1}\bigl(\frac{T}{\bar T_0}\bigr)^s \tag{4.9}$$

for arbitrarily large s and $T\in[\bar T_0,T_1]$ where

$$\bar T_0\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C_0\varepsilon^{-1}h=T_0/|\log h|. \tag{4.10}$$

Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma'(q_{(\nu)}u_n)\bigr)|\le C\varepsilon^2\mu h^{-1}\bigl(\frac{T}{\bar T_0}\bigr)^sT. \tag{4.11}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma'(q_{(\nu)}u_n)\bigr)|\le C\varepsilon^2\mu h^{-1}\bar T_0 \tag{4.12}$$

for any $T\in[\bar T_0,T_1]$.

Further, due to the standard ellipticity arguments $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma'(q_{(\nu)}u_n)\bigr)$ is negligible unless

$$|\mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)|\le C\varepsilon\qquad\text{on } \operatorname{supp} q_{(\nu)} \tag{4.13}$$

and for each τ, n the set $\Omega_{\tau,n}=\{(x_2,\xi_2):|\mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)|\le C\varepsilon\}$ has measure $O(\varepsilon)$ due to non-degeneracy condition. Therefore we get estimate

$$|F_{t\to\mu^{-1}h}\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma'(Qu_n)|\le C\mu h^{-1}\bar T_0\times\varepsilon=C\mu \tag{4.14}$$

which implies (4.8) and by the standard Tauberian arguments implies

$$|\Gamma(\psi Q_x e)(\tau)-h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(\psi Qu)\bigr)\Bigr)d\tau'|\le \\ C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon) \tag{4.15}$$

with $\bar\chi=1$ on $[-\frac12,\frac12]$, $T\in[T_0,T_1]$ which is exactly estimate we want. However we need to calculate

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\bigr)\Bigr)d\tau'. \tag{4.16}$$

Note that we cannot take $T=\bar T_0$ here, only $T=T_0$.

4.3 Calculations. I

To calculate (4.16) we rewrite it modulo negligible terms as the sum with respect to n,ν of

$$\mathcal{S}_{n(\nu)}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \\ h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\biggl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\tilde\psi(x,\mu^{-1}hD)q^{\mathrm{w}}_{(\nu)}\bigl(u_n\Upsilon_n(x_1)\Upsilon_n(x_1)\bigr)\bigr)\Bigr)\biggr)\,d\tau' \tag{4.17}$$

with $q_{(\nu)}=q^{\mathrm{w}}_{(\nu)}(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)$.

One can see easily that on elliptic elements (with (4.13) failed)

$$\mathcal{S}_{n(\nu)}\equiv\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu h^{-1}\iint\theta\bigl(\tau-\mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr)\tilde\psi(x,\xi)q_{(\nu)}(x_2,\xi_2)\,dx\,d\xi \tag{4.18}$$

modulo negligible expression; here $\theta\bigl(\tau-\mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr)=\mathrm{const}$ on $\operatorname{supp} q_{(\nu)}$ and we need to calculate the difference between these two expressions on non-elliptic elements (satisfying

(4.13)). The total contribution of such terms is not very large: it is less than $Ch^{-1}\times\mu\times\varepsilon\times\frac{1}{\mu h}$ where the first factor is just present in (4.17), the second one is an estimate (4.14) of Fourier transform $(F_{t\to\mu^{-1}h}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma'(Qu_n))$, the third is here because this Fourier transform is negligible for $|\tau'-\tau|\ge C\varepsilon$ and the last one is the number of n for which (4.13) holds on $\operatorname{supp} q_{(\nu)}$. Still this expression $C\varepsilon h^{-2}$ is larger than what we need.

We apply method of successive approximations to calculate these terms; as unperturbed operator we take

$$\begin{aligned}(4.19)\quad \mathcal{B}_n &= \mathcal{A}_n(y,\mu^{-1}hD_x),\\ \mathcal{R}_n &= \mathcal{A}_n-\mathcal{B}_n(y,\mu^{-1}hD_{x_2})=(x_2-y_2)\mathcal{Q}_n(x,y,\mu^{-1}hD_x)\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}(4.20)\quad u_n^{\pm}(x_2,y_2,t)\overset{\text{def}}{=}\theta(\pm t)u(x_2,y_2,t)=\mp ih\mathcal{G}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)\delta(t)=\\ \mp ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)\delta(t)\mp ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{R}_n\mathcal{G}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)\delta(t)\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ are forward/backward parametrices for the Cauchy problem for operators $hD_t-\mathcal{B}_n$ and $hD_t-\mathcal{A}_n$ respectively. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}(4.21)\quad u_n^{\pm}(x_2,y_2,t)Q_y^t=\mp ih\mathcal{G}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)Q_y^t\delta(t)=\\ \mp ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)Q_y^t\delta(t)\mp ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{R}_n\mathcal{G}_n^{\pm}\delta(x_2-y_2)Q_y^t\delta(t)\end{aligned}$$

for $Q_y=Q(y_2,\mu^{-1}hD_{y_2})$ where we write pdo acting on y on the right in accordance to matrix theory and my previous papers, Q^t denotes transposed operator (adjoint and complex-conjugate).

So, $u_n=u_n^0+u_n^1$ where u^0 is a Schwartz kernel of propagator for $\mathcal{B}_n$ and

$$u_n^{1\pm}=\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{R}_nu_n^{\pm}.\tag{4.22}$$

We take (x_2-y_2) and carry it forward using commuting relation

$$[\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm},(x_2-y_2)]=\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}[\mathcal{B}_n,x_2-y_2]\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\tag{4.23}$$

and in the very front this factor will be killed by Γ'. Then for our purpose we can replace $u_n^{1\pm}$ by

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}[\mathcal{B}_n,x_2-y_2]\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{Q}_nu_n^{0\pm}.\tag{4.24}$$

Let us dump it in (4.16). Consider first

$$F_{\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\varphi_T(t)\Gamma'\Bigl(\bigl(u_n^1(\tilde{\psi}q_{(\nu)}^{\mathrm{w}})_y^t\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigr)\tag{4.25}$$

with either $\varphi_T=\bar{\chi}_T$, $T=\bar{T}_0$ or $\varphi_T=\chi_T$, $T\ge \bar{T}_0$; I remind that $\bar{T}_0=Ch/\varepsilon$.

In the first case ($\varphi_T=\bar{\chi}_T$, $T=\bar{T}_0$) our estimate is rather straightforward. Note that norm of $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_n^\pm$ in the strip $\{|t|\le T\}$ does not exceed $h^{-1}T$, norm of $[\mathcal{B}_n, x_2-y_2]$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h$. Then factor (x_2-y_2) translates into extra factor $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}T^2$ in the norm estimate. For $T=\bar{T}_0$ this factor is $C\mu^{-1}h\varepsilon^{-2}=C|\log h|^{-1}$ and in the general case it will be $C|\log h|^{-1}T^2/\bar{T}_0^2$.

Further, we can assume that norm of $\mathcal{R}_n$ does not exceed $C\varepsilon^{l-1}|\log h|^{-\sigma}+C\varepsilon$. Really, we always can make $\partial_{x_2}W$ vanish at some point of $\operatorname{supp} q_{(\nu)}$ by an appropriate FIO corresponding to some linear symplectomorphism at (x_2,ξ_2)-plane. Then in this case (4.25) does not exceed $C\mu\varepsilon^{l-1}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$; I remind that for u^0 it was just $C\mu$.

In the second case ($\varphi_T=\chi_T$, $T\ge\bar{T}_0$) we, using standard rescaling arguments, gain extra factor $(\bar{T}_0/T)^s$ with arbitrarily large exponent s which takes care of all $(T/\bar{T}_0)^k$ factors and summation with respect to partition of unity with respect to t. Now we can conclude that (4.25) does not exceed $C\mu\varepsilon^{l-1}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ for $\varphi=\bar{\chi}$, $T=T_0$. Then applying arguments we used to estimate the total contribution of our "special" elements $q_{(\nu)}$ to (4.16), we see that the total contribution of these "special" elements $q_{(\nu)}$ to (4.16) with u replaced by u^1 does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\varepsilon^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ which is exactly a mollification error estimate.

Now let us consider contribution of u^0. One can see easily that it is exactly equal to the left-hand expression of

$$\Gamma'\Bigl(\theta\bigl(\tau-\mathcal{A}_n(y_2,\mu^{-1}hD_{x_2})\bigr)K_{(\nu)}\Bigr)= (2\pi)^{-1}\mu h^{-1}\iint \theta\bigl(\tau-\mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr)k_{(\nu)}(x_2,\xi_2)\,dx_2\,d\xi_2 \tag{4.26}$$

where $K_{(\nu)}=\tilde{\psi}_n q^{\mathrm{w}}_{(\nu)}$, $k_{(\nu)}$ is its *pq*-symbol[29] and

$$\tilde{\psi}_n=\langle\tilde{\psi}\Upsilon_n,\Upsilon_n\rangle \tag{4.27}$$

where $\Upsilon_n=\Upsilon_n(x_1)$ and $\langle .,.\rangle$ is an inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}_{x_1})$.

The problem is that *pq*-symbols are not invariant with respect to FIOs and the difference between *pq*- and Weyl symbols is not small because of $q_{(\nu)}$. However, there is a simple walk-around. Cover our total (x_2,ξ_2)-domain by two, with $\partial_{\xi_2}W$ and $\partial_{x_2}W$ disjoint from 0 respectively. We consider the first domain; the second case will be reduced to the first one easily, by means of FIO.

We can consider partition of unity (depending on n) $q'_{(\nu_1)}(x_2)q'_{(\nu_2)}(\xi_2)$ such that for each ν_1 (and each n) there is no more than one number ν_2 such that condition (4.13) holds on

---

[29] Which means that $K=k(\overset{1}{x},\mu^{-1}h\overset{2}{D_x})$.

$\operatorname{supp} q'_{(\nu_1)} \times \operatorname{supp} q''_{(\nu_2)}$. Then all the contributions of all other elements do not depend on this FIO and summing with respect to ν_2 we get just $q'_{(\nu_1)}(x_2)$. But we can take the required linear symplectomorphism $(x_2,\xi_2)\mapsto (x_2,\xi_2 - r_{(\nu_1)}x_2)$ and the corresponding FIO will be just multiplication by $e^{-i\mu h^{-1}r_{(\nu)}x_2^2/2}$ which does not affect $q'_{(\nu_1)}(x_2)$. On the other hand, for $\tilde\psi$ the difference between different symbols does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h$ and therefore without increasing our remainder estimate we can rewrite our final answer as

$$(2\pi)^{-1}\mu h^{-1}\sum_{n\ge 0}\iint \theta\bigl(\tau - \mathcal{A}_n(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr)\tilde\psi_n(x_2,\xi_2)\,dx_2\,d\xi_2. \tag{4.28}$$

4.4 Calculations. II

To finish the proof of Theorem 0.1(ii),(iii) we need to bring expression (4.28) with $\tau=0$ to more explicit form.

First of all, we need to use original (x_1,x_2)-coordinates rather than (x_2,ξ_2)-coordinates after reduction. The natural expression of the area form in (x_1,x_2)-coordinates is $\omega = \sqrt{g}dx_1\wedge dx_2$ which can be considered as the area form on $\Sigma=\{p_1=p_2=0\}$ such that $\omega\wedge dp_1\wedge dp_2 = dx\wedge d\xi$. Then after construction of subsections 3.1-3.2 we have a symplectic map Φ which transforms Σ into $\Sigma_0=\{x_1=\xi_1=0\}$; let us denote $\Phi|_\Sigma$ by ϕ. Further, Φ transforms $g^{-\frac12}dp_1\wedge dp_2$ at points of Σ exactly into $-dx_1\wedge d\xi_1$ at points of Σ_0. Therefore $\phi_*\omega = -dx_2\wedge d\xi_2$.

Consider next transformations of subsection 3.3. If $V=0$ these transformations will preserve Σ_0 and be identical on it. In the general case one can check easily that these transformations transform point $(0,0;x_2,\xi_2)\in\Sigma_0$ into $\bigl(\zeta_1(x_2,\xi_2),\zeta_2(x_2,\xi_2);x_1+\eta_1(x_2,\xi_2),x_2+\eta_2(x_2,\xi_2)\bigr)\in\Sigma'_0$ with $|\zeta_j|+|\nabla\zeta_j|\le C\mu^{-2}$, $|\eta_j|+|\nabla\eta_j|\le C\mu^{-4}+C\varepsilon^l|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma}$, and therefore after projecting Σ'_0 onto Σ_0: $(x_1,\xi_1;x_2,\xi_2)\mapsto(0,0;x_2,\xi_2)$ we have $(1+k)dx_2\wedge d\xi_2$ with $k=0$ unless $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ and μ is close to $h^{-\frac13}$ and $k=\mu^{-4}k_1(x)$ in the latter case.

So, instead of $-dx_2\wedge d\xi_2$ in our formula we can use $(1+k)\sqrt{g}dx_1dx_2$ and instead of $W(x_2,\xi_2,\rho_n)$ we can use $W_n\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}W(\phi(x_1,x_2),r_n)$; further, obviously one can find $w(x_1,x_2)$ of the same regularity as W such that $(2n+1)\mu h+W_n<0$ if and only if $(2n+1)\mu h+w<0$ and replace $W_n(x)$ by $w(x)$.

One should not be very concerned with the difference between ψ and ψ_n because we are interested in calculations when $\psi=1$ and then $\psi_n=1$ as well.

Anyway, one can prove easily that $\tilde\psi_n(x_2,\xi_2)=\psi\circ\phi^{-1}+\mu^{-2}\psi'_n+\mu^{-4}\psi''_n$ where ψ'_n, ψ''_n are defined by (4.27) with $\tilde\psi$ replaced by ψ', ψ'' respectively, and with symbols ψ', ψ'' belonging to $\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma},\mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$ and not depending on μ,h and one can take ψ''_n, ψ'' equal to 0 unless $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ and μ is close to $h^{-\frac13}$. Then we get the final formula with the correction term

$$\begin{aligned}(4.29)\qquad &\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{2,\mathrm{corr}} =\\ &\frac{1}{2\pi}h^{-2}\int\sum_n\Bigl(\theta\bigl(-w-(2n+1)\mu h\bigr)-\theta\bigl(-V-(2n+1)\mu h\bigr)\Bigr)\mu h\psi(x)dx+\\ &\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\int\sum_n\theta\bigl(-w-(2n+1)\mu h\bigr)(\psi'_n\circ\phi)\,dx+\\ &\mu^{-3}h^{-1}\int\sum_n\theta\bigl(-w-(2n+1)\mu h\bigr)(\psi''_n\circ\phi+k)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

The second term is equal to

$$\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\int\Bigl(\mathrm{Tr}_1\bigl(\Pi_w\psi'(x_1,x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_1,\xi_2)\bigr)\circ\phi\Bigr)\,dx$$

where Π_w is the spectral projector in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for harmonic oscillator $\mu^2x_1^2+h^2D_1^2$ and Tr_1 is an operator trace in $L^2(\mathbb{R}_{x_1})$. One can apply Weyl formula to calculate this expression. The error will not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\times\bigl(1+\varepsilon^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\bigr)$ where the last factor is the remainder estimate for Weyl formula for $\mathrm{tr}\bigl(\Pi_w\psi'(x_1,hD_1)\bigr)$ [30]. Therefore this error does not exceed desired $Ch^{-2}\bigl(\mu^{-1}h+\vartheta(\varepsilon)\bigr)$.

On the other hand, the Weyl answer is

$$h^{-2}\iint\theta\bigl(-w-r^2\bigr)\psi'(x,\mu^{-1}r\cos\alpha,\mu^{-1}r\sin\alpha)\,rd\,r\,d\alpha\,dx.$$

I remind that $w-V=O\bigl(\vartheta(\mu^{-1})\bigr)$ and then replacing w by V we make an error not exceeding $C\mu^{-2-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}h^{-2}\le C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$. We can treat the third term in (4.29) in the same way. Therefore

(4.30) Without deterioration of the remainder estimate the second and third terms in (4.29) can be rewritten as $K_1\mu^{-2}h^{-2}$ and $K_2\mu^{-4}h^{-2}$ respectively with some constants K_1, K_2.

I claim that

(4.31) With an error not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\mu h)$ one can replace in the first term in (4.29) the Riemann sum by the corresponding integral.

---

[30] Actually, C is the remainder estimate and $C\varepsilon^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ is an estimate for error in calculations.

Really, without any loss of the generality one can assume that $|\partial_{x_j}V|\ge\epsilon_0$ with either $j=1$ or $j=2$ and the same is true for w. Then the first part of the first term in (4.29) is equal to

$$h^{-2}\int\sum_n \mu h\theta\Bigl(\tau-w-(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)(\partial_{x_j}w)(\partial_{x_j}w')^{-1}\psi(x)\,dx+ \\ h^{-2}\mu h\int\sum_n \theta\bigl(\tau-w-(2n+1)\mu h\bigr)(\partial_{x_j}w)\Bigl((\partial_{x_j}w)^{-1}-(\partial_{x_j}w')^{-1}\Bigr)\psi(x)\,dx \tag{4.32}$$

where w' is μh-mollification of w. Note that $\bigl((\partial_{x_j}W_n)^{-1}-(\partial_{x_j}W')^{-1}\bigr)$ does not exceed $C(\mu h)^{l-1}|\log\mu h|^{-\sigma}$ and therefore passing in the corresponding term from the Riemann sum to the corresponding integral brings an error not exceeding $Ch^{-2}\times\mu h\times(\mu h)^{l-1}|\log\mu h|^{-\sigma}$. On the other hand, the first term in (4.32) is equal to

$$h^{-2}\int\sum_n\Bigl(\tau-w-(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)_+\bigl(\partial_{x_j}(\partial_{x_j}w')^{-1}\psi(x)\bigr)\mu h\,dx$$

with $\bigl(\partial_{x_j}(\partial_{x_j}w')^{-1}\psi(x)\bigr)$ not exceeding $(\mu h)^{l-2}|\log\mu h|^{-\sigma}$ and passing from the Riemann sum to the corresponding integral brings an error not exceeding $Ch^{-2}\times(\mu h)^2\times(\mu h)^{l-2}|\log\mu h|^{-\sigma}$ for $(l,\sigma)\preceq(2,0)$; for $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ we need to repeat this procedure one more time to recover the same estimate.

So, (4.31) is proven and with an error not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\mu h)$ the first term in (4.29) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{4\pi}h^{-2}\int\Bigl((w_- - V_-\Bigr)\psi(x)dx=\frac{1}{4\pi}h^{-2}\int(V-w)\psi(x)dx$$

due to condition (0.13).

So we get that with indicated error the correction term is

$$\frac{1}{4\pi}h^{-2}\int(V-w)\psi(x)\,dx+h^{-2}\bigl(K_1\mu^{-2}+K_2\mu^{-4}\bigr) \tag{4.33}$$

with V, K_1,K_2 not depending on μ^{-1} and w depending on it.

Comparing with the results for the weak magnetic field (section 2) when correction term is 0 [31] we see that expression (4.33) vanishes modulo $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}+\vartheta(\varepsilon)h^{-2}\bigr)$, with

---

[31] Surely for $\mu\asymp h^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{-\frac13}$ we can take the same mollification but we also removed operator with A_0-bound not exceeding $\vartheta(\varepsilon)$ and one can see easily that it brings error not exceeding $Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\varepsilon)$.

$\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and then (4.29) transforms into

$$\begin{aligned}(4.34)\quad \mathcal{E}_{2,\mathrm{corr}} &\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \\ & h^{-2}\int \sum_n \Bigl(\theta\bigl(\tau - W - (2n+1)\mu h\bigr) - \theta\bigl(\tau - V - (2n+1)\mu h\bigr)\Bigr)\mu h\psi(x)\,dx - \\ & \frac{1}{2}h^{-2}\int (V-W)\psi(x)\,dx\end{aligned}$$

where we replaced notation w by W.
▶ Theorem 0.1(ii) is proven.

4.5 Calculations: $\mu \ge h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$

In this case calculations are easy. We just should remember the correction h^2W' with W' defined by (0.19)-(0.20) to potential.

5 $d = 3$ and magnetic field is relatively weak

In this section we consider the case

$$\mu \le \bar{\mu}_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{5.1}$$

In the smooth case then one needs to reduce operator to canonical form only to analyze relatively long (comparing with $\epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$) propagation of singularities but not to calculate asymptotics. The same situation preserves in non-smooth case and to recover sharp asymptotics one needs neither non-degeneracy nor extra smoothness. This is the same threshold as for $d = 2$ despite rather different mechanism.

5.1 Preliminary remarks

We consider microlocally mollified Schrödinger operator in the strong magnetic field given by (0.1) with symmetric positive matrix (g^{jk}), real-valued V_j, V and small parameters h, ε and large parameter μ. We assume that the corresponding magnetic field $F^l(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jk}\upsilon^{jkl}(\partial_{x_j}A_k - \partial_{x_k}A_j)$ does not vanish in $B(0,1)$; then we can straighten it and direct along x_1 by an appropriate change of variables and make $V_1 = 0$ by an appropriate gauge transformation. We assume that this has been done and impose smoothness conditions to the reduced operator.

Namely we assume that for this reduced operator conditions (0.2), (0.5) hold and

$$g^{jk}, V, F^3 \in \mathcal{F}^{1,\sigma}(B(0,1)), \qquad F^1 = F^2 = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

We start from the case (further restrictions to follow)

$$\varepsilon \ge Ch|\log h|, \quad \mu \le C^{-1}h|\log h|^{-1} \tag{5.3}$$

Then

$$h^{-1}[A, x_j] = \sum_k \bigl(g^{jk}P_k + P_k g^{jk}\bigr)(\tag*{$(5.4)_1$}$$

$$h^{-1}[A, P_3] = h^{-1}\sum_{j,k} P_j[g^{jk}, P_1]P_k + h^{-1}[V, P_3] \tag*{$(5.4)_2$}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{-1}h^{-1}[A, P_i] = (-1)^{l+1}F_{23}\sum_k (g^{5-i,k}P_k + P_k g^{5-i,k}) +{}\\ \mu^{-1}h^{-1}\sum_{jk} P_j[g^{jk}, P_i]P_k + \mu^{-1}h^{-1}[V, P_i] \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \tag*{$(5.4)_3$}$$

have symbols of class $\mathcal{F}^{1,\sigma}$ in any domain $\{a(x,\xi) \le c\mu^{-2}\}$ of bounded energy where

$$a(x,\xi) = a_0(x,\xi) + \mu^{-2}V, \quad a_0(x,\xi) = \sum_{j,k} g^{jk}p_j(x,\xi)p_k(x,\xi), \qquad p_j(x,\xi) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\xi_j - V_j). \tag{5.5}$$

To finish preliminary remarks let us notice that the following statetement holds

Proposition 5.1. *Let $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $f = 1$ in $B(0, C_0)$ with large enough constant C_0. Let $T \ge h^{1-\delta}$. Then under condition (5.2) with large enough constant $C = C_s$*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(1 - f\bigl(p_1(x,\xi), p_2(x,\xi), p_3(x,\xi)\bigr)\Bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}\chi_T(t)u| \le Ch^s \qquad x, y \in B(0, \frac{1}{2}), \tau \le c. \tag{5.6}$$

One can see easily that f is quantizable under condition (5.3) and the proof is rather obvious.

5.2 Heuristics

Let us consider operator (0.1) with Euclidean metrics. Then for time $T_1 = \epsilon_0|\xi_3|$ the shift with respect to ξ_3 will be less than $\frac{1}{2}|\xi_3|$ and so ξ_3 will be of the same magnitude and sign. Then the shift with respect to x_3 will be of magnitude $|\xi_3|T$ because ξ_3 is a speed of the propagation along x_3 and in order it to be observable we need logarithmic uncertainty principle

$$|\xi_3|T \cdot |\xi_3| \geq Ch|\log h| \tag{5.7}$$

because we need to use $|\xi_3|$-sized scale along ξ_3. This gives us the value T_0 for which we can claim that $(\Gamma u)(t)$ is negligible for $|t| \in [T_0, T_1]$: $T_0 = Ch|\log h| \cdot |\xi_3|^{-2}$. Since we know $(\Gamma u)(t)$ for $|t| \leq \bar{T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ due to condition (0.13) and rescaling, we would like to have these intervals overlap: $\bar{T} \geq T_0$ or, equivalently,

$$|\xi_3| \geq \bar{\varrho}_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} C\sqrt{\mu h|\log h|}. \tag{5.8}$$

Then contribution of zone $\mathcal{Z}_1^c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{|\xi_3| \geq \bar{\varrho}_1\}$ to the remainder does not exceed $\int Ch^{-2}\int T_1^{-1}\,d\xi_3$. This integral diverges logarithmically at $\xi_3 = 0$ and is equal to $Ch^{-2}|\log\bar{\varrho}_1|$; to improve remainder estimate to Ch^{-2} we will need to increase T_1 to $\epsilon|\xi_3| \cdot \bigl|\log|\xi_3|\bigr|^{\sigma'}$ with $\sigma' > 1$.

On the other hand, the contribution of zone $\mathcal{Z}_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{|\xi_3| \leq \bar{\varrho}_1\}$ to the remainder does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\bar{T}^{-1}\bar{\varrho}_1 = C\mu\bar{\rho}_1h^{-2}$ and in order to keep it below Ch^{-2} we need to have $\mu\bar{\varrho}_1 \leq C$ which is exactly condition (5.1). But in this case zone $\{|\xi_3| \leq C\mu^{-1}\}$ is covered by these latter arguments we can take $C\mu^{-1}$ as a critical value and replace (5.8) by a stronger restriction

$$|\xi_3| \geq \bar{\varrho}_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} C\mu^{-1}. \tag{5.9}$$

Condition (5.8) will be restored in sections 6,7 where we analyze the case $\mu \geq C(h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and restriction (5.8) is stronger.

This analysis is basically “smoothness-independent”.

5.3 Variable ε

So far we did not discuss the choice of ε; however, since the scale with respect to ξ_3 is $C|\xi_3|$ in the zone $\mathcal{Z}_2^c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{|\xi_3| \geq \bar{\varrho}_2\}$ the logarithmic uncertainty principle requires $\varepsilon \geq Ch|\log h| \cdot |\xi_3|^{-1}$. To reduce approximation error we pick up the smallest allowed ε there:

$$\varepsilon = Ch|\log h| \cdot |\xi_3|^{-1}. \tag{5.10}$$

Then the contribution of $\mathcal{Z}_2^c$ to the approximation error will be $Ch^{-3}\int\vartheta(\varepsilon)d\xi_3$ which is $O(h^{-2})$ as $l=1,\sigma=2$.

On the other hand, in zone $\mathcal{Z}_2\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{|\xi_3|\le\bar\varrho_2\}$ scale with respect to ξ_3 is $\asymp\bar\rho_2$ and logarithmic uncertainty principle requires $\varepsilon=\bar\varepsilon_2\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}Ch|\log h|\cdot\bar\varrho_2^{-1}=C\mu(h|\log h|)^{-1}$ (which will be also important value in sections 6,7 as it was in sections 3,4). Then the contribution of this zone to the approximation error will be $Ch^{-3}\bar\varrho_2\vartheta(\bar\varepsilon_2)$ which is $O(h^{-2})$ as $l=1,\sigma\ge1$.

However, if we tried to use $\varepsilon=\bar\varepsilon_1$ everywhere we would get an approximation error $Ch^{-2}\vartheta(\bar\varepsilon_1)$ which is not $O(h^{-2})$ unless stronger smoothness condition is satisfied.

So, for $d=3$ we will need ε to be a function of ξ_3 and may be of x. Really, if we pick up the minimal allowed constant $\varepsilon=\bar\varepsilon_2$ then approximation error will be $O\bigl(h^{-3}\vartheta(\bar\varepsilon_2)\bigr)$ and to keep it below h^{-2} we would need to increase l.

We already met such situation in [Ivr2]. We will pick ε to be a temperate function:

$$\rho|\nabla_\xi\varepsilon|+\gamma|\nabla_x\varepsilon|\le c\varepsilon \tag{5.11}$$

where (γ,ρ) is (x,ξ)-scale. In this case we introduce

$$\tilde A=\sum\psi_\alpha^*\tilde A_\alpha\psi_\alpha \tag{5.12}$$

where ψ_α are (γ,ρ)-admissible functions, $\psi_\alpha^*\psi_\alpha$ is a partition of unity and $\tilde A_\alpha$ are mollifications of A with $\varepsilon=\varepsilon_\alpha$ calculated at some points of the corresponding elements.

5.4 Rigorous analysis

As I already mentioned we consider now the case of the weak magnetic field: $\mu\le\bar\mu_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}h^{-\frac13}\bigl|\log h\bigr|^{-\frac13}$ assuming that

$$l=1,\quad \sigma>1 \tag{5.13}$$

and we will not press very hard to reduce σ. Let us consider point $(\bar x,\bar\xi)$ with

$$\varrho\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}|\bar\xi_3|\ge\bar\varrho_2\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C\mu^{-1},\quad \varepsilon=Ch\varrho^{-1}|\log h|. \tag{5.14}$$

I remind that the second condition (to ε) means logarithmic uncertainty principle; thus quantization is possible; we will take ε variable but depending on ξ_3 only.

Let us consider a classical propagation starting from this point. Obviously $|\frac{d}{dt}\xi_3|\le C_0$ due to condition ((5.4)$_3$) which implies that ξ_3 keeps it magnitude during time $|t|\le\epsilon_0\varrho$ even in the general (not Euclidean) case but we need a bit better. Let us consider

$$\{\mu^2a(x,\xi),\xi_3\}=\beta(x,\xi)\xi_3+\mu\sum_{j,k=1}^{2}\beta_{jk}p_jp_k-\partial_{x_3}V$$

with $\beta_* \in \mathcal{F}^{0,\sigma}$. In the smooth case we would be able to eliminate the second term in the right-hand expression by replacing ξ_3 by

$$\ell = \xi_3 + \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \beta'_{jk} p_j p_k \tag{5.15}$$

with appropriate coefficients β'_* found from the linear algebraic system which we would get from equality

$$\{\mu^2 a(x,\xi), \ell(x,\xi)\} \equiv \beta'(x,\xi)\xi_3 + \mu\beta'' a_0(x,\xi) - \partial_{x_3} V \qquad \mod O(\mu^{-1})$$

(since $|p_j| \le C\mu^{-1}$). In our case we replace β'_{jk} by their $h^{-\delta}$-mollifications; then we would get the above equations modulo $O(|\log \varrho|^{-\sigma})$. Finally, one can find that $\mu^2\beta'' = \partial_3 F$ and therefore

$$\{\mu^2 a(x,\xi), \ell(x,\xi)\} \equiv \beta'(x,\xi)\ell(x,\xi) + \mu^2\beta'' a(x,\xi) - F\partial_{x_3}(V/F) \\ \mod O(|\log \varrho|^{-\sigma}). \tag{5.16}$$

Then in an appropriate time direction[32] inequality $\pm\ell \ge \frac{1}{2}\varrho$ holds for $|t| \in [0, T_1]$ with

$$T_1 = T_1(\varrho) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon\varrho |\log \varrho|^{\sigma}. \tag{5.17}$$

This additional logarithmic factor is a small but a crucial progress in comparison with $T_1 = \epsilon_0 \varrho$ we had before.

Then using the following function with an appropriate sign ς in the standard [BrIvr] propagation arguments

$$\varphi\Bigl(\pm\frac{1}{\varrho}\bigl((\ell(x,\xi) - \ell(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})\bigr) + c\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Bigr) \tag{5.18}$$

one can prove the similar statement on microlocal level (due to conditions (5.2), $(5-4)_{1-3}$, (5.13)-(5.14) all symbols will be quantizable):

Proposition 5.2. *Let conditions (5.2), (5.3), (5.13) − (5.14) be fulfilled. Let Q_0 be h-pdo supported in ϱ-vicinity of $(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ with $|\bar{\xi}_3| = \varrho \ge C\mu^{-1}$. Let Q' be h-pdo with symbol equal to 1 in ϱ'-vicinity of $(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ (with $\varrho' = C\varrho|\log\varrho|^{\sigma}$), intersected with $\{|\xi_3| \ge \frac{1}{2}\varrho\}$.*

Then $(1-Q')\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{t})Q$ is negligible for $\varsigma t \in [0, T_1]$ with T_1 given by (5.17) appropriate $\varsigma = \pm 1$ where here and below $\mathbf{U}(t)$ is a propagator associated with A:

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = e^{-ih^{-1}At}. \tag{5.19}$$

---

[32] That means for t of an appropriate sign; namely the sign of $-\xi_3\partial_{x_3}(V/F)$.

This statement shows that for $\varsigma t\in[0,T_1]$ singularity of $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{t})Q$ is confined to ϱ'-vicinity of $(\bar{x},\bar{\xi})$ intersected with $\{|\xi_3|\ge \frac{1}{2}\varrho\}$.

Now let us consider classical propagation along x_3; then $\frac{d}{dt}x_3=\{\mu^2a,x_3\}=2g^{33}\xi_3+\mu\sum_{j=1}^2 2g^{3j}p_j$. Replacing x_3 by

$$\phi = x_3+\sum_{j=1}^{2}\alpha_j p_j \tag{5.20}$$

with appropriate coefficients α_j found from an appropriate linear algebraic system we would able in the smooth case get

$$\{\mu^2 a,\phi\}\equiv 2g^{33}\xi_3 \qquad \mod O(\mu^{-1}). \tag{5.21}$$

In the non-smooth case we do the same and no mollification is needed since $\alpha_j\in\mathcal{F}^{1,\sigma}$. So, the classical shift with respect to ϕ for time t with $\varsigma t\in[0,T_1]$ will be at least $\epsilon_0\varrho t$ which is "observable" if $\epsilon_0\varrho|t|\times\varrho\ge Ch|\log h|$.

On the microlocal level using the same arguments of [BrIvr] with function

$$\varphi\Bigl(\varsigma_1\frac{1}{\varrho T}\bigl(\phi(x,\xi)-\phi(y,\xi)\bigr)\pm c\frac{t}{T}\Bigr) \tag{5.22}$$

(which again is quantizable due to our conditions) with an appropriate sign $\varsigma_1=\pm1$ one can easily prove that for $\varsigma t\in[T_0,T_1]$,

$$T_0=C\varrho^{-2}h|\log h| \tag{5.23}$$

and $\psi(x_3)$, supported in ϵ-vicinity of $\bar{x}_3$, $\psi(x_3)\mathbf{U}(t)Q\psi(x_3)\equiv0$. Then $\operatorname{Tr}\mathbf{U}(t)Q\equiv 0$. Then this is true for $|t|\in[T_0,T_1]$ *with no restriction to the sign because of the trace*. Therefore we have

Proposition 5.3. *Let above assumptions be fulfilled. Then for any $T\in[T_0,T_1]$*

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}(t)-\bar{\chi}_T(t)\bigr)\Gamma(uQ^t_y)\Bigr)\equiv 0. \tag{5.24}$$

I remind that χ, $\bar{\chi}$ are admissible functions, supported in $[-1,1]$ and equal to $0,1$ respectively on $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$.

Then the same statement holds for $Q=\psi(x)\chi_\varrho(hD_3)$ (we can sum with respect to the partition of unity in (x,ξ_1,ξ_2)). *From now on operator Q is given by this formula.*

On the other hand, from the standard theory rescaled we already know $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar\chi_{\bar T}(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\Bigr)$ with $\bar T=\epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$ and in order to combine these two results we need to have $T_0\ge \bar T$ which is equivalent to (5.8); this condition is wider than our current frames; right now we have $\sqrt{\mu h|\log h|}\le \mu^{-1}$ which exactly means that $\mu\le\bar\mu_1=h^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{-\frac13}$.

Then from the standard theory rescaled we conclude that

$$|F_{t\to h\tau}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\Bigr)|\le C\varrho h^{-2} \tag{5.25}$$

for any $T\in[T_0,T_1]$. With this estimate the standard Tauberian arguments imply that

$$\mathcal{R}_Q\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}|\Gamma(\tilde e Q_y^t)(\tau)-h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\Bigr)\Bigr)d\tau'|\le\\ C\varrho h^{-2}T_1^{-1}=Ch^{-2}|\log\varrho|^{-\sigma}. \tag{5.26}$$

Let us take the sum with respect to partition on ξ_3 in zone $\mathcal{Z}_2^c=\{|\xi_3|\ge\bar\varrho_2\}$. Then the right-hand expression of this formula transforms into $Ch^{-2}\int_{\bar\varrho_2}^1\varrho^{-1}|\log\varrho|^{-\sigma}d\varrho$ which does not exceed Ch^{-2} as long as $\sigma>1$.

On the other hand, it follows from the standard theory rescaled that (5.25) holds for $Q=\psi(x)\bar\chi_\varrho(hD_3)$ and $T=\bar T=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$. Therefore for $\varrho=\bar\varrho_2$ we have $\mathcal{R}_{\bar Q}\le C\bar\varrho_2h^{-2}/\bar T=Ch^{-2}$.

Combining this estimate with the result of the previous analysis we get the final inequality $\mathcal{R}_\psi\le Ch^{-2}$.

Further, from the final theory rescaled we know $F_{t\to h\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\bigr)$ for $T=\bar T$ and we get the final estimate[33)]

$$|\int\Bigl(\tilde e(x,x,\tau)-\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau)\Bigr)\psi(x)\,dx|\le Ch^{-2} \tag{5.27}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,\tau)=(2\pi)^{-3}\int\theta\bigl(\tau-\tilde A(x,\xi)\bigr)\,d\xi \tag{5.28}$$

and $\tilde A$ is a symbol of the mollified operator and this is h-pdo because we take ε depending on ξ_3 [34)].

[33)] There should be also a term $C\mu^2h^{-1}$ in the right-hand expression but for $\mu\le\bar\mu_1$ it is less than Ch^{-2}. I will discuss this expression with more details later.

[34)] Which means that we take appropriate partition of unity, on each element take its own ε, mollify and then add. One can check easily that perturbation is small enough to preserve all our arguments.

Now let us consider an approximation error in $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}$. It does not exceed

$$Ch^{-3}\int \varepsilon^{l}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma}\,d\varrho = Ch^{-2}|\log h|^{1-\sigma}\log\mu \tag{5.29}$$

which is $O(h^{-2})$ as $\sigma=2$ [35].

This finishes the proof of Theorem 0.3(i).

6 $d=3$ and magnetic field is rather strong. Canonical form

From now on we will consider more difficult case

$$\mu\ge\bar{\mu}_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C^{-1}h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}};\tag{6.1}$$

further restrictions will be added later.

Using arguments of section 5 we will show later (in subsection 7.1.) that the contribution of the zone $\mathcal{Z}_1^{\mathrm{c}}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\varrho}_1\}$, $\bar{\varrho}_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, to the remainder estimate does not exceed Ch^{-2}.

Unfortunately the trivial estimate in zone $\mathcal{Z}_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\varrho}_1\}$ brings remainder estimate $O(\mu\bar{\varrho}_1h^{-2})=O(h^{-2}\sqrt{\mu^3h|\log h|})$ only. This is not because of the lack of smoothness but the deficiency of the method.

6.1 Canonical form. Preliminary remarks

To treat this zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$ properly one needs to reduce operator to the canonical form as in section 6.2 of [Ivr1]. However, as for $d=2$, to follow this procedure one must assume that $\varepsilon\ge C\mu^{-1}|\log h|$ at least and then the approximation error will be too large unless the regularity condition holds with $l\ge 2$.

On the other hand, these arguments still work, but for much larger μ. One of the reasons is that even if we neglect an approximation error, the remainder estimate would be at least $\mu h^{-1}\times\mathcal{R}_1$ where $\mathcal{R}_1$ is the remainder estimate for 1-dimensional Schrödinger operator. Unless we assume that V/F is non degenerate (i.e. $\nabla(V/F)\ne 0$) we can derive nothing better than $\mathcal{R}_1=O\bigl(h^{-\frac{2}{2+l}}\bigr)$ according to [Ivr5] and therefore we should not expect anything better than estimate $O\bigl(\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{2+l}}\bigr)$ for our magnetic 3-dimensional Schr$\ddot{\text{d}}$inger operator anyway. For $l=1$ this coincides with h^{-2} for $\mu=h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ exactly.

---

[35] Exactly in this place we need to have variable ε rather than to take its largest value $\varepsilon(\bar{\varrho}_1)=C\mu h|\log h|$ which would require too restrictive smoothness conditions to get approximation error $O(h^{-2})$.

However for μ close to $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ we need to modify reduction arguments properly and the rest of the section is devoted to this.

We pay mainly attention to the case

$$C_0h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\le \mu\le C_0^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \tag{6.2}$$

and analyze zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$.

First of all we need to decide what does "non-essential" mean.

(i) Under non-degeneracy condition (0.11) the contribution of zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$ to the approximation error in $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ does not exceed $Ch^{-3}\bar{\varrho}_1R$ where R is an upper bound for a perturbation. To prove this one needs to notice that for $\varrho\le\varrho_1^*\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\sqrt{\mu h}$ due to this condition the measure of the zone $\mathcal{Y}_\varrho\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{\rho^2\le\min_{n\ge0}|\tau-V-(2n+1)\mu h|\le2\varrho\}$ does not exceed $C\varrho^2/\mu h$ and its contribution to the approximation error in $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ does not exceed $C\bigl(h^{-3}\bar{\varrho}_1\mu h^{-2}\varrho^{-1}\bigr)R\times\varrho^2/\mu h$. Then the total contribution of $\mathcal{Z}_1$ to the approximation error does not exceed this expression integrated by $\varrho^{-1}d\varrho$ which gives exactly $Ch^{-3}\bar{\varrho}_1R$.

On the other hand, under condition (0.11) the remainder estimate will be $O\bigl(h^{-2}\bigr)$ and therefore to keep approximation error below it we need to make calculations with precision

$$R\le R^*\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{6.3}$$

Therefore in $\mathcal{Z}_1$ we can increase ε up to

$$\varepsilon^*=C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{\frac{3}{2}} \tag{6.4}$$

as $(l,\sigma)=(1,2)$.

(ii) In the general case (i.e. without non-degeneracy condition) the contribution of $\mathcal{Z}_1$ to the approximation error in $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ does not exceed $Ch^{-3}\bar{\varrho}_1R+C\mu h^{-2}R^{\frac{1}{2}}$ while we expect the remainder estimate to be $O\bigl(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2+l}}\bigr)$; then to keep approximation error below it we need to make calculations with precision

$$R_*=C\min\bigl(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}},\mu^{-2}+h^{\frac{2l}{2+l}}|\log h|^{-\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}}\bigr) \tag{6.5}$$

where $(l,\sigma)\preceq(2,1)$. Note that R given by this formula is larger than $\varepsilon^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ with ε defined by (6.1). Therefore in the general case we can increase ε up to

$$\varepsilon_*=C(R^*)^{\frac{1}{l}}|\log h|^{\frac{\sigma}{l}}. \tag{6.6}$$

Later further increase will be made.

6.2 Canonical form. I

We assume that $g^{jk}\in\mathcal{F}^{2,1}$ even if one can weaken conditions. We call term *non-essential* if its A-bound does not exceed R_* given by (6.5); under condition (0.11) we can increase it to R^*.

In the zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$ we need to have

$$\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{6.7}$$

or larger. Note that for ε given by (6.7) mollification error $\varepsilon^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ does not exceed R_*.

To transform operator A to the canonical form I would like first to transform its principal part to the "diagonal form" as it was done for $d=2$. This can be achieved by the same transformation (3.4) $T(t)\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}tL^{\mathrm{w}}}$ with $L^{\mathrm{w}}=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k}P_jL^{jk}P_k$. Then (3.5)-(3.8) are preserved but now we have 3×3 commutator matrix $J=\begin{pmatrix}J' & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ where $J'=\begin{pmatrix}0 & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ and $\Lambda=f(x)\ell J=\begin{pmatrix}\Lambda' & 0\\ \Lambda'' & 0\end{pmatrix}$ with $\Lambda'=\begin{pmatrix}\ell^{12} & -\ell^{21}\\ \ell^{22} & -\ell^{21}\end{pmatrix}$, $\Lambda''=(\ell^{32}\ \ -\ell^{31})$. Then $e^{t\Lambda}=\begin{pmatrix}e^{t\Lambda'} & 0\\ \Lambda''K(t) & 1\end{pmatrix}$ with matrix $K(t)=(\Lambda')^{-1}(e^{t\Lambda'}-I)$ which is well defined even if Λ' is degenerate. Therefore we can achieve $e^{\Lambda^T}Ge^{\Lambda}$ to be diagonal with the top-left element equal to 1. However we cannot change g^{33} by this method unless we use "much larger" operator L (something like $\omega(x)\mu hD_3$) which is not a good idea at this moment in non-smooth case.

The rest of the analysis of subsection 3.1 does not change and and therefore we get that *modulo operator with A-bound not exceeding $\mu^{-1}h$*

$$T(-1)A_0T(1)\equiv P_1^2+P_2(g')^{\mathrm{w}}P_2+P_3(g'')^{\mathrm{w}}P_3+\mu^2M^{\mathrm{w}}, \tag{6.8}$$

$$M\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}a_0\circ\phi_1-p_1^2-g'^{22}p_2^2-g'^{33}p_2^2 \tag{6.9}$$

(compare with (3.17),(3.18)).

I remind that according to (3.13) $M=\sum_{i,j,k}\beta_{ijk}p_ip_jp_k$ with $\beta_{ijk}\in\mathcal{F}^{1,1}$. Finally, modulo non-essential operator $T(-1)VT(1)\equiv(V\circ\phi_1)^{\mathrm{w}}$.

Now, we can assume that g',g'' are functions of x only because we can achieve it modifying M but not changing its type. Further, condition $F=1$ means that $\sqrt{g'}f=1$ and we can apply the same construction as in subsection 3.1 and therefore we can assume without any loss of the generality that

$$V_1=V_3=0,\quad P_1=hD_1\implies V_2=V_2(x_2,x_3), \tag{6.10}$$

$$V_2,\partial_{x_1}V_2\in\mathcal{F}^{2,1} \tag{6.11}$$

and

$$p_2 = \alpha(x,\xi_2)\bigl(x_1 - \lambda(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\bigr), \qquad \alpha,\lambda\in\mathcal{F}^{2,1}. \tag{6.12}$$

Repeating then construction of subsection 3.2, we take the next transformation $T'(t) = e^{-i\lambda^{\rm w}D_1}$. As a result we will get operator

$$T'(-1)T(-1)A_0T(1)T'(1) \equiv \bar{A}_0 + \bigl(\mu^2 M'\bigr)^{\rm w}, \tag{6.13}$$

$$\bar{A}_0 \overset{\rm def}{=} \bar{P}_1^2 + \bar{P}_2^2 + \bar{P}_3\alpha_0^{\rm w}\bar{P}_3, \quad \bar{P}_1 = hD_1, \bar{P}_2 = -\mu x_1, \bar{P}_3 = hD_3, \tag{6.14}$$

$$M' = a_0\circ\Phi - \bar{a}_0 = \sum_{i,j,k}\beta'_{ijk}\bar{p}_i\bar{p}_j\bar{p}_k \tag{6.15}$$

with $\bar{p}_1 \overset{\rm def}{=} \xi_1$, $\bar{p}_2 \overset{\rm def}{=} -x_1$, $\bar{p}_3 \overset{\rm def}{=} \xi_3$, $\Phi \overset{\rm def}{=} \phi_1\circ\phi'_1$, where ϕ_t, ϕ'_t are corresponding Hamiltonian flows, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\in\mathcal{F}^{2,1}$ (compare with (3.26)-(3.28)).

Further, modulo operator with $\bar{A}_0$-bound not exceeding $C\vartheta(\varepsilon)$

$$T'(-1)T(-1)A_0T(1)T'(1) \equiv (V\circ\Phi)^{\rm w}. \tag{6.16}$$

So far precision was better than we needed: it was $\varepsilon^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$, exactly as in subsections 3.1, 3.2. We could make $\alpha_0 = 1$ but it would be not very useful.

6.3 Canonical form. II

Now we will follow subsection 3.3 but with a twist. Namely, we define S', S'', W', W'' *exactly* by (3.37)-(3.40) and apply transformation $T''(-t) = e^{-it\mu h^{-1}S^{\rm w}}$ with phase $S = S' + S''$. Then modulo non-essential term

$$T''(-t)\Bigl(\bar{A}_0 + \bigl(\mu^2M' + V'\bigr)^{\rm w}\Bigr)T''(t) \equiv \Bigl(\bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + \mu^2M' + V'\bigr)\circ\psi_t\Bigr)^{\rm w} \tag{6.17}$$

where ψ_t is a corresponding Hamiltonian flow. Let us calculate symbol

$$\begin{aligned}\bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + \mu^2M' + V'\bigr)\circ\psi_t = \mu^2\bar{a}_0 + \bigl(\mu^2M' + V'\bigr) - t\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0, S\}\\ - t\{\mu^2M' + V', S\} - \frac{t^2}{2}\{\{\bar{a}_0,S\},S\} + \ldots,\end{aligned}$$

and plug $t = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0, S\} &= 2\mu^2(\xi_1\partial_{x_1} - x_1\partial_{\xi_1})S + 2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S) + \{\alpha_0^2, S\}\xi_3^2\\ &= \mu^2M' + V' - W_0 + 2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S) + \{\alpha_0^2, S\}\xi_3^2\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to (3.37),(3.38) and $W_0 = W' + W''$.

Further, let us notice that $|\xi_3| \le \mu^{-1}\bar{\varrho}_1 = C\sqrt{\mu^{-1}h|\log h|}$ in our zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$ where an extra factor μ^{-1} appears because in the reduction part we consider $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo. Then one can see easily that modulo non-essential operator (in the general sense) our transformed operator equals to the quantization of

$$\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + W_0 - 2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S) - \frac{1}{2}\{\mu^2 M' + V' - W_0, S\}' \tag{6.18}$$

where $\{.,.\}'$ again mean "short" Poisson brackets (with respect to x_1, ξ_1 only).

Obviously the last term in (6.18) is $O(\mu^{-2})$ and it is essential only for $\mu \le \hat{\mu}_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \epsilon_0 h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Furthermore, $\partial_{x_3}S = O\bigl(\mu^{-1-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + \mu^{-3}\bigr)$ and therefore the second term in (6.18) is $O\bigl((\mu^{1-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + \mu^{-2})\cdot(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)$ which does not exceed R^* but is not necessarily smaller than R_*.

Therefore, if condition (0.11) is fulfilled and $\mu \ge \hat{\mu}_1$ then we have finished because only the first term in (6.18) is essential. In this case we got operator

$$\bar{A}_0 + W_0(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2, \mu^{-1}hD_3, \mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{6.19}$$

with

$$W_0(x_2, x_3, \xi_2, \xi_3, \rho) = \mathcal{M}_\rho(\mu^2 M' + V'). \tag{6.20}$$

Furthermore, under condition (0.11) we will see later that for $\mu \le \hat{\mu}_1$ we do not need full canonical form at all.

However, in the general case the second and the third terms in (6.18) are essential and we need to continue in the same way as in subsection 3.4. Let us define S_1, S''', W_1, W''' in the same way as before:

$$W''' = \alpha_0^2\partial_{x_3}\mathcal{M}_\rho S, \qquad W_1 = -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}_\rho\{\mu^2 M' + V' - W_0, S\}', \tag{6.21}$$

$$2\mu^2(\xi_1\partial_{x_1} - x_1\partial_{\xi_1})S''' = \alpha_0^2\partial_{x_3}(S - \mathcal{M}_\rho S), \tag{6.22}$$

$$2\mu^2(\xi_1\partial_{x_1} - x_1\partial_{\xi_1})S_1 = -\frac{1}{2}\{\mu^2 M' + V' - W_0, S\}' + W_1; \tag{6.23}$$

I remind that $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(x_2, x_3, \xi_2)$. Let us apply $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo transformation $T'''(t) = \bigl(e^{-it\mu h^{-1}(S'''\xi_3 + S_1)}\bigr)$ then

$$T'''(-1)\Bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + W_0 - 2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S) - \frac{1}{2}\{\mu^2 M' + V' - W_0, S\}'\Bigr)^{\mathrm{w}} T'''(1) \equiv$$
$$\Bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0 + W_0 - 2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S) - \frac{1}{2}\{\mu^2 M' + V' - W_0, S\}' -$$
$$\mu^2\{\bar{a}_0, S'''\xi_3 + S_1\} + \dots\Bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}.$$

Plugging (6.21)-(6.22) we see easily that

$$\begin{multline}\tag{6.24} T'''(-1)\Bigl(\mu^2\bar{a}_0+W_0-2\mu^2\alpha_0^2\xi_3(\partial_{x_3}S)-\\ \frac{1}{2}\{\mu^2M'+V'-W_0,S\}'\Bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}T'''(1)\equiv\\ \bar{A}_0+Wx_2,x_3,\mu^{-1}hD_2,\mu^{-1}hD_3,B)\end{multline}$$

where $W=W_0+W'''\xi_3+W_1$.

The last step is not really necessary, but we’ll do it for the sake of simple canonical form. First of all, transformation $T^V(1)$, $T^V(t)=e^{-it\omega^{\mathrm{w}}D_3}$ with $\omega=\omega(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\in\mathcal{F}^{2,1}$ transforms D_3 into $(\partial_{x_3}\omega)^{\mathrm{w}}D_3+\beta^{\mathrm{w}}\mu^{-1}hD_3^2$ with $\beta=\beta(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\xi_3)\in\mathcal{F}^{1,1}$ and therefore one can transform $\alpha_0^{\mathrm{w}}D_3$ into $D_3+\beta^{\mathrm{w}}\mu^{-1}hD_3^2$. Thus, modulo non-essential operator $T^V(-1)\bar{A}_0T^V(1)\equiv h^2D_1^2+\mu^2x_1^2+D_3^2$. One can see easily that $T^V(-1)W^{\mathrm{w}}T^V(1)\equiv W^{\mathrm{w}}+N^{\mathrm{w}}\mu^{-1}hD_3$ with $N\in\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$.

Further, modulo non-essential term we can rewrite our reduced operator in the form $\bar{A}_0+\bar{W}^{\mathrm{w}}+\bar{N}^{\mathrm{w}}\mu^{-1}hD_3$ with $\alpha_0=1$ in expression (6.14) for $\bar{A}_0$ and $\bar{W}=\bar{W}(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$ where $\bar{W}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}W|_{\xi_3=0}\in\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$, $\bar{N}=\bar{N}(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$,
$\bar{N}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}(\partial_{\xi_3}W)|_{\xi_3=0}\in\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$.

Finally, applying transformation $T^{VI}(1)$ with $T^{VI}(t)=e^{-it\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\omega'^{\mathrm{w}}}$ and $\omega'=\omega'(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\mu^{-1}\bar{A}_0$
$\omega'\in\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$ we will get (for an appropriate symbol ω') modulo negligible operator $\bar{A}_0+\bar{W}^{\mathrm{w}}$.

6.4 Canonical form. III. $\mu\ge\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$

In this case again an A-bound for $\mu^{-1}P_j$ does not exceed $C\varepsilon$ and construction is absolutely straightforward as in the smooth case; I just note that $R^*=Ch$ and

$$\tag{6.25} R_*=C\min\bigl(h,h^{\frac{2l}{2+l}}|\log h|^{-\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}}\bigr)=C\begin{cases}h & \text{for } (l,\sigma)\preceq(2,0).\\ h|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} & \text{for } l=2, 0<\sigma\le 1.\end{cases}$$

7 “Standard” spectral asymptotics

In this section I want to prove asymptotics based on $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T\Gamma\psi Qu\bigr)$ with $T=\bar{T}=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$ for μ as large as possible; here $Q=q(hD_3)$ is a cut-off operator. First of all, I analyze the outer zone $\mathcal{Z}_1^c\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{|\xi_3|\ge\bar{\varrho}_1\}$. Then under condition (0.11) I analyze the inner zone $\mathcal{Z}_1\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\varrho}_1\}$.

7.1 Outer zone

First of all, for $\mu \le c^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ one can apply exactly the same arguments as in section 5 [36] with

$$\varrho \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} |\bar{\xi}_3| \ge \bar{\varrho}_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} C\bigl(\mu h|\log h|\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \varepsilon = Ch\varrho^{-1}|\log h| \tag{7.1}$$

and get an estimate (5.26) for Q with symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_1^c$. Then to derive asymptotics of $\Gamma(\tilde{e}Q_y^t)$ (at this stage we include ψ in Q) we need to calculate

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} \Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau' \tag{7.2}$$

with $T = \bar{T} = \epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$. Note that

(7.3) Expression (7.2) with $T = \bar{T}$ equals modulo $O(h^s)$ to the same expression with $T = T_0 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} Ch|\log h|$.

Really, let us break Q into few operators $Q_{(\nu)}$, with symbols supported in ϵ-vicinity of points $(\bar{x}_{(\nu)}, \bar{\xi}_{(\nu)})$. Without any loss of the generality one can assume that $g^{jk} = \delta_{jk}$ at $\bar{x}_{(\nu)}$ [37]. Then if $|\bar{\xi}_{(\nu)j}| \ge \epsilon_0$ (with small enough $\epsilon > 0$) both the propagation speed and scale with respect to x_j are disjoint from 0, $j = 1, 2, 3$ and we can apply arguments of [BrIvr] (repeated here many times).

Now, to calculate (7.2) with $T = T_0$ we can apply the method of successive approximations. However, it is not very convenient to take unperturbed operator in our standard way $\bar{A} = A(y, hD_x)$ because then one can estimate $(m+1)$-th term of (7.2) with the approximation plugged only by

$$h^{-3}|\log h|\bigl(\mu T_0^2 h^{-1}\bigr)^m \asymp h^{-3}|\log h|\bigl(\mu h|\log h|^2\bigr)^m$$

which is not good as μ close to $h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ even if we reduce powers of logarithms (which is not very difficult).

Instead we take unperturbed operator

$$\bar{A} = \sum_{j,k} \bar{P}_j g^{jk}(y)\bar{P}_k + V(y), \qquad \bar{P}_j = hD_{x_j} - \mu V_j(y;x), \tag{7.4}$$

$$V_j(y;x) = V_j(y) + \sum_k (\partial_k V_j)(y)(x_k - y_k)$$

---

[36] And we need $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ only.

[37] We can achieve it by a linear change of coordinates preserving direction of the magnetic field $\mathbf{F}$.

as we did already in 2-dimensional case (1.11). I remind that without any loss of generality we assume $V_3 = 0$ and $V_j = V_j(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{F}^{2,2}$.

With this choice of an unperturbed operator one can estimate $(m+1)$-th term of (7.2) with the approximation plugged by

$$h^{-4}T_0\bigl(\mu T_0^3 h^{-1} + T_0^2 h^{-1}\bigr)^m \asymp h^{-3}|\log h|\cdot\bigl(h|\log h|^2\bigr)^m$$

(I remind that $\mu \le Ch|\log h|^{-1}$). One can reduce the power of logarithms but it is not worth of our efforts now; I just notice that modulo $O(h^{-2})$ (7.2) is equal to the same expression with u replaced by $u^0 + u^1$ where u^0 and u^1 are first two terms of approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} u^0 &= -ih\sum_{\varsigma=\pm}\varsigma\bar{\mathcal{G}}^\varsigma\delta(x-y)\delta(t),\\ u^1 &= -ih\sum_{\varsigma=\pm}\varsigma\bar{\mathcal{G}}^\varsigma\mathcal{R}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^\varsigma\delta(x-y)\delta(t) \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^\pm$ are forward and backward parametrices for $(hD_t - \bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{R} = A - \bar{A}$.

Now we want to get rid of the contribution of u^1 and only extra logarithmic factors in its estimate prevents us. Then we need just notice that due to the rescaling method the corresponding term in (7.2) with $\bar{\chi}_T$ replaced by χ_T with $T \ge \bar{T}_0 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} Ch^{-1}$ does not exceed $CTh^{-4}\times T^2h^{-1}\times\bigl(\frac{\bar{T}_0}{T}\bigr)^s$ with an arbitrarily large exponent s. Then the sum with respect to t-partition does not exceed Ch^{-2}. On the other hand, this term calculated with $\bar{\chi}_T$ and $T = \bar{T}_0$ does not exceed Ch^{-2} as well. Therefore the total contribution of u^1 to the final answer does not exceed Ch^{-2}.

Finally, let us calculate (7.2) with $u = u^0$. Without any loss of the generality one can assume that $g^{jk}(y) = \delta_{jk}$; we need later to get the answer in the invariant form. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &u^0(x,y,t) = \\ &\qquad h^{-1}\iint e^{-ih^{-1}\bigl(-t(\xi_3^2+\tau'+V(y))+(x_3-y_3)\xi_3\bigr)}\,d\xi_3\,d_{\tau''}\bar{e}_y(x_1,x_2;y_1,y_2;\tau'') \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

where $\bar{e}_y(x_1,x_2;z_1,z_2;\tau)$ is the Schwartz kernel of the spectral projector of $\bar{P}_1^2 + \bar{P}_2^2$ and "y" indicates the same point as in (7.4). Direct calculations (see [Ivr1], Chapter 6 for example) show that

$$\bar{e}_y(x_1,x_2;y_1,y_2;\tau'') = \sum_{n\ge 0}\theta\Bigl(\tau'' - (2n+1)\mu hF(y)\Bigr)F(y)\mu h^{-1} \tag{7.7}$$

and

$$\Gamma_y\bigl(u^0Q_y^t\bigr)=\int\sum_{n\ge 0} e^{ih^{-1}t\bigl(\xi_3^2+(2n+1)\mu hF(y)+V(y)\bigr)}q(\xi_3)\,d\xi_3\times F(y)\mu h^{-2},\tag{7.8}$$

$$\begin{gathered}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(uQ_y^t)\Bigr)=\\ \sum_{n\ge 0}T\int\widehat{\bar\chi}\Bigl(Th^{-1}\bigl(\tau'-(2n+1)F(y)\mu h-V(y)-\xi_3^2\bigr)\Bigr)\times\\ q(\xi_3)\,d\xi_3\times F(y)\mu h^{-2}\end{gathered}\tag{7.9}$$

where $\widehat{\bar\chi}$ is a Fourier transform of $\bar\chi$ and modulo $O(h^{-2})$ (7.2) is finally equal to $\int\mathcal{E}_Q^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\psi(x)\,dx$ with

$$\mathcal{E}_Q^{\mathrm{MW}}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\sum_{n\ge 0}\int\theta\Bigl(\tau-(2n+1)F\mu h-V-\xi_3^2\Bigr)q(\xi_3)\,d\xi_3\times F\mu h^{-2}.\tag{7.10}$$

One can check easily that $\varepsilon|\log h|^{-2}\le\varrho^2$ for $\varrho\ge\bar\varrho_1$ and therefore the approximation error of $\mathcal{E}_Q^{\mathrm{MW}}$ does not exceed $C\int h^{-3}\varepsilon|\log h|^{-2}d\varrho\le Ch^{-2}$. So we get

Proposition 7.1. *Let $(l,\sigma)=(1,2)$ and $\bar\mu_1\le\mu\le c^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$. Let $Q=q(hD_3)$ with $q=1-\bar\chi_{\bar\varrho_1}(\xi_3)$*

Then

$$|\int\Bigl(\Gamma_x(eQ_y^t)-\mathcal{E}_Q^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\Bigr)\psi(x)\,dx|\le Ch^{-2}\tag{7.11}$$

with $\mathcal{E}_Q^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)$ defined by (7.10).

7.2 Non-degenerate case

Now I want to prove that under condition (0.11) $\Gamma(u\psi Q_y^t)$ is negligible for $\bar T\le|t|\le\epsilon$ as

$$\varepsilon=C\mu h|\log h|\quad\text{in }\mathcal{Z}_1\tag{7.12}$$

and $Q=q(hD_3)$ with symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_1$. Namely:

Proposition 7.2. *Let condition (0.11) be fulfilled, $Q=q(hD_3)$ with appropriate symbol q supported in $\mathcal{Z}_1$. Then*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\chi_T\Gamma\psi u\bigr)|\le Ch^s\qquad\forall\tau:|\tau|\le\epsilon\tag{7.13}$$

as $T\in[T_0,T_1]$ *where* χ *an admissible function supported in* $[-1,-\frac{1}{2}]\cup[\frac{1}{2},1]$ *and*

$$T_0=C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|,\qquad T_1=\epsilon. \tag{7.14}$$

In particular (*7.13*) *holds as* $T\in[\bar{T}_0,\epsilon]$ *with* $\bar{T}_0=\epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$ *for* ε *given by* (*7.12*).

Corollary 7.3. *Under conditions* (*0.11*), (*0.13*), (*7.12*)

$$|\int\Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,\tau)-\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}u(x,x,t)\bigr)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le Ch^{-2}, \tag{7.15}$$

$$|\int\Bigl(\tilde{e}(x,x,\tau)-\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\Bigr)\psi(x)dx|\le Ch^{-2}. \tag{7.16}$$

Remark 7.4. (i) Note that under condition (0.11) and ε given by (7.12) the contribution of zone $\mathcal{Z}_1$ to the approximation error does not exceed
$C(\mu h|\log h|)^{l+\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\sigma}h^{-3}$ which is in turn does not exceed Ch^{-2} as long as

$$\mu\le\mu_{(l,\sigma)}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}Ch^{-\frac{2l-1}{2l+1}}|\log h|^{-1+\frac{2\sigma}{2l+1}} \tag{7.17}$$

while remainder estimate does not exceed Ch^{-2} anyway.

(ii) Note that $\mu_{(1,2)}=h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and $\mu_{(l,\sigma)}\sim h^{-1+\delta}$ in the smooth case when l is large.

Now statement (i) of theorem 0.4 follows from propositions 7.1, 7.2, corollary 7.3 and remark 7.4

Proof. of Proposition 7.2. Making ϵ_1-partition we can assume that on it $|\nabla V-\ell|\le\epsilon$ at each point with some fixed ℓ, $|\ell|\ge 4\epsilon$.

Let us consider first the case when $|\ell_\perp|\ge\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, $\ell_\perp=(\ell_1,\ell_2)$ and examine propagation of singularities with respect to (x_2,ξ_2) for the transformed operator.

To time T the shift with respect to x_2 will be $\asymp\epsilon|\ell_2|\mu^{-1}$ and the logarithmic uncertainty principle means that $\epsilon_2|\ell_2|\mu^{-1}T\times\varepsilon\ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$ which for $|\ell_2|\ge\epsilon$ is equivalent to $T\ge T_0$ with T_0 given by (7.4).

Similarly, to time T the shift with respect to ξ_2 will be $\asymp\epsilon|\ell_1|\mu^{-1}$ and the logarithmic uncertainty principle means that $\epsilon_2|\ell_1|\mu^{-1}T\times\varepsilon\ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$ which for $|\ell_1|\ge\varepsilon$ is equivalent to $T\ge T_0$ again.

We can justify this analysis by our standard propagation arguments with functions

$$\varphi\bigl(\mu\frac{x_2-y_2}{\ell_2T}\pm\epsilon\frac{t}{T}\bigr),\quad\varphi\bigl(\mu\frac{\xi_2-\eta_2}{\ell_1T}\pm\epsilon\frac{t}{T}\bigr) \tag{7.18}$$

respectively.

On the other hand, let us consider the case $|\ell_3| \ge \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and examine propagation of singularities with respect to ξ_1. To time T the shift will be $\asymp \epsilon|\ell_3|$ and and the logarithmic uncertainly principle means that $\epsilon|\ell_3|\mu^{-1} \times \varepsilon \ge Ch|\log h|$ which is equivalent to $T \ge T_0$ again.

We can justify this analysis by standard means with a function

$$\varphi\bigl(\frac{\xi_3-\eta_3}{\ell_3 T} \pm \epsilon \frac{t}{T}\bigr). \tag{7.19}$$

In both cases upper bound for T is a small constant because for this time (x_2, x_3, ξ_2, ξ_3) keeps in ϵ_1-vicinity of the point of origin [38] which can be justified by standard means with functions

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi\bigl(\frac{t}{T} \pm \epsilon\mu\frac{\xi_2-\eta_2}{T}\bigr), &&\varphi\bigl(\frac{t}{T} \pm \epsilon\mu\frac{x_2-y_2}{T}\bigr),\\ &\varphi\bigl(\frac{t}{T} \pm \epsilon\frac{\xi_3-\eta_3}{T}\bigr), &&\varphi\bigl(\frac{t}{T} \pm \epsilon\frac{x_3-y_3}{T}\bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

□

Remark 7.5. The above proof uses canonical form and therefore requires $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$. However, one can provide the alternative proof, similar to ones in subsection 2.3, which uses “precanonical” form (i.e. variables Q_1, Q_2); now it is enough $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$. I leave details to the reader.

7.3 Weakly-degenerate case

Let us consider point $\bar{x}$ in which

$$|\nabla V| \asymp \zeta \ge C'|\log h|^{-\sigma'}, \qquad (l,\sigma) \succeq (1,\sigma'). \tag{7.21}$$

Then the same is true in its γ-vicinity with $\gamma = h^\delta$ with some small $\delta > 0$ provided $C' = C'(\delta)$ is large enough if $(l,\sigma) = (1,\sigma')$; otherwise no restriction on C' is needed. Thus all the arguments of the previous subsection remain valid but now for time $\bar{T} = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ the shift with respect to ξ_3 will be $\asymp \zeta\bar{T}$ provided $|\nabla_\parallel V| \asymp \zeta$ and the shift with respect to (x_2, ξ_2) will be $\asymp \mu^{-1}\zeta\bar{T}$ provided $|\nabla_\perp V| \asymp \zeta$ and therefore logarithmic uncertainty principle is fulfilled if

$$\varepsilon \ge C\zeta^{-1}\mu h|\log h|. \tag{7.22}$$

---

[38] Actually it can be longer for small ℓ_3 but there is no benefit from this observation.

We need to assume also that $\gamma \ge C\varepsilon$ which is always the case provided $\mu \le h^{\delta_0-1}$ with $\delta_0 > \delta$.

Then we can take

$$T_1 = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{for } l = 1, \\ \epsilon\zeta & \text{for } l > 1 \end{cases} \tag{7.23}$$

and the contribution of this particular element $\psi_\gamma(x)q_\varrho(hD_3)$ to the remainder estimate will be $O\bigl(\varrho\gamma^3h^{-2}T_1^{-1}\bigr)$ (we assume that q is compactly supported). We can take always $\varrho = C\bar\varrho_1$ and we estimated contribution of $\psi_\gamma(x)\bigl(1-q_\varrho(hD_3)\bigr)$ to the remainder estimate as $O(\gamma^3h^{-2})$. So the contribution of $\psi_\gamma(x)$ to the remainder estimate is $O(\gamma^3h^{-2})$ anyway.

Now let us consider its contribution to the approximation error. In our assumptions it does not exceed

$$Ch^{-2}\gamma^3 + C\varrho\gamma^3h^{-3}\vartheta(\varepsilon) \asymp Ch^{-2}\gamma^3 + C\gamma^3h^{-3}(\mu h|\log h|)^{l+\frac{1}{2}}\zeta^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \tag{7.24}$$

and to keep it below $C\gamma^3h^{-2}$ we need to assume that

$$\zeta \ge \mu^{\frac{2l+1}{2l}}h^{\frac{2l-1}{2l}}|\log h|^{\frac{2l-2\sigma-1}{2l}}; \tag{7.25}$$

in particular, for $(l,\sigma) = (1,2)$

$$\zeta \ge \mu^{\frac{3}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{7.26}$$

which is possible only for $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{3}}$.

8 Spectral asymptotics

This section finishes the analysis of 3-dimensional Schrödinger operator under condition (0.13). First of all, we have decomposition similar to one we had in two-dimensional case. Using this decomposition we prove that spectral asymptotics based on $Ft \to h^{-1}\tau\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(u\psi)\bigr)$ with $T = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ still holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{-2})$ for $\mu \le \mu_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and thus prove theorem 0.3(ii).

Then we analyze the case $\mu \ge \mu_1$ in two different settings: under non-degeneracy condition (0.11) we prove theorem 0.4(ii),(iii) and without it we prove theorem 0.6.

8.1 Decomposition

First of all, as I mentioned, we have decomposition, similar to (4.1)-(4.2): we reduce our operator to the family of 1-dimensional Schrödinger operators with respect to x_3 which are also $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos with respect to x_2

$$\mathcal{A}_n = hD_3^2 + r_n^2 + W(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2, \mu^{-1}r_n), \qquad r_n = \bigl((2n+1)\mu h\bigr)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{8.1}$$

with $x' = (x_1, x_2)$ and arrive to decomposition

$$u(x,y,t) \equiv \mathcal{T}\Bigl(\sum_{n\ge 0} u_n(x', y', y_3, t)\Upsilon_n(x_1)\Upsilon_n(y_1)\Bigr)\mathcal{T}^{-1} \tag{8.2}$$

where $u_n(x', y', t)$ are Schwartz kernels of the propagators for $\mathcal{A}_n$.

8.2 Proof of Theorem 0.3(ii)

After above reduction , essentially we have 1-dimensional Schrödinger operators with respect to x_3 but with potentials which are $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos with respect to x_2. We need to consider case

$$\bar{\mu}_1 = Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le \mu_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} C_1 h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \tag{8.3}$$

under assumption $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$; however, we consider general $\sigma \ge 2$. Further, due to analysis of sections 5,7 we need to consider only contribution to asymptotics and the remainder estimate of *intermidiate zone*

$$\mathcal{Z}' \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\varrho_1 \le |\xi_3| \le \bar{\varrho}_1\} \qquad \text{with } \varrho_1 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} C_1\mu^{-1} \tag{8.4}$$

because we already know that the contribution of outer zone $\mathcal{Z}_1^c = \{|\xi_3| \ge \bar{\varrho}_1\}$ to the remainder is $O(h^{-2})$ and the contribution of the *core zone*

$$\mathcal{Z}_0 \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{|\xi_3| \le \varrho_1\} \tag{8.5}$$

to the remainder is $O(\varrho_1\mu h^{-2}) = O(h^{-2})$. In definition (8.4) C_1 is an arbitrarily large constant.

Making $\tilde{\gamma}$-admissible partition with respect to x with $\tilde{\gamma} = h^\delta$ we should consider two cases

$$|\nabla V| \asymp \zeta \qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp}\psi', \qquad \zeta \in [\bar{\zeta}, 1], \tag*{$(8.6)_1$}$$

$$|\nabla V| \le \bar{\zeta} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} C|\log h|^{-\sigma} \qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp}\psi' \tag*{$(8.6)_2$}$$

where ψ' is a $\tilde{\gamma}$-admissible element of the partition with respect to x. Further, taking in account the results of subsection 7.3, we can restrict ζ from above by the right-hand expression in (7.26) (or (7.25)):

$$\zeta \le \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{8.7}$$

In what follows $\zeta = \bar{\zeta}$ in the case $(8.6)_2$.

Let us reduce operator to the canonical form and for any single n introduce temperate functions of (x_2, x_3, ξ_2)

$$\gamma = \gamma_{(n)} = \epsilon \zeta^{-1} |W + (2n+1)\mu h|, \qquad \rho = C(\gamma\zeta)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{8.8}$$

We still keep $\varepsilon = C\rho^{-1} h |\log h|$ and we consider now zone $\{\gamma \ge \bar{\gamma}'_1\}$ with $\bar{\gamma}'_1 = C\zeta^{-\frac{1}{3}} (h|\log h|)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ (or equivalently $\{\rho \ge \bar{\varrho}'_1\}$ with $\bar{\varrho}'_1 = C(\zeta h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{3}})$ chosen to have $C^{-1}\gamma \ge \varepsilon \ge C(\mu^{-1} h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It is possible that $\bar{\varrho}'_1 \le C\mu^{-1}$; in this case we *redefine* $\bar{\varrho}'_1$ as $C\mu^{-1}$.

First of all, using standard propagation of singularities one can see easily that

$$\Gamma'\bigl(Q' Q_3 u_n\bigr) \equiv 0 \text{ for } T_0 \le |t| \le T_1 \text{ with } T_0 = Ch\rho^{-2} |\log h|, \tag{8.9}$$

$$T_1 = \epsilon \begin{cases} \bigl(\zeta^{-1}\rho + \zeta\bigr) & \text{as } (8.6)_1, \\ \bar{\zeta}^{-1}\rho & \text{as } (8.6)_2 \end{cases}. \tag{8.10}$$

Here $Q' = Q'(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1} h D_2)$ and $Q_3 = q_\varrho(hD_3)$ are elements of the corresponding γ-admissible and ϱ-admissible partitions; q is supported in $[-1, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and *here* $\varrho = \rho$.

Note that

$$T_1 \ge \epsilon \bar{\zeta}^{-1} \rho, \qquad T_0 \le T_1. \tag{8.11}$$

Further, using standard propagation and rescaling technique one can see easily that

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma'(Q' Q_3 u_n)| \le CT\rho\gamma^3 \mu h^{-2} \bigl(\frac{\bar{T}_0}{T}\bigr)^s \tag{8.12}$$

with $T \in [\bar{T}_0, T_1]$ and $\bar{T}_0 = \rho^{-2} h$. Here and below χ and $\bar{\chi}$ are the same standard functions which we used before.

Remark 8.1. (i) Due to ellipticity arguments, estimate

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma'(Q' Q_3 u_n)| \le Ch^s (1 + \varrho)^{-s} \tag{8.13}$$

holds for $\varrho \ge C\bigl(\rho + |\tau|^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)$.

(ii) It also holds for $\rho \ge C\bigl(\varrho + |\tau|^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)$ and q supported in $\{|\xi_3| \le 1\}$. In this statement we do not need to assume that q vanishes in $\{|\xi_3| \le \frac{1}{2}\}$.

Therefore only elements with $\rho \asymp \varrho$ provide non-negligible contribution.

Then inequality similar to (8.9) holds with Q' replaced by $\tilde{Q}'$ which is an element of $\tilde{\gamma}$-admissible partition of unity and with γ replaced by $\tilde{\gamma}$; and now we can return to our original function u:

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3u\bigr)\Bigr)| \le CT\varrho\tilde{\gamma}^3\mu h^{-2}\bigl(\frac{\bar{T}_0}{T}\bigr)^s\times\frac{\rho^2}{\mu h} \tag{8.14}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}$ is an element of $\tilde{\gamma}$-admissible partition with respect to x and the factor $\varrho^2/(\mu h)$ appears because there are no more than different numbers n which contribute. Here we do not have ρ anymore.

It implies two important inequalities:

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3u\bigr)\Bigr)| \le C\varrho\tilde{\gamma}^3h^{-2} \tag{8.15}$$

and

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}-\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}\bigr)(t)\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3u\bigr)\Bigr)| \le C\varrho\tilde{\gamma}^3h^{-2}\bigl(\frac{\mu h}{\varrho^2}\bigr)^s \tag{8.16}$$

as $\bar{T}=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$.

The first of them implies that

$$|\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3e(.,.,0)\bigr)-h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^0\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}(t)\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3u\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigr)d\tau| \le C\varrho\tilde{\gamma}^3h^{-2}T_1^{-1}\le C\bar{\zeta}\tilde{\gamma}^3h^{-2}. \tag{8.17}$$

On the other hand, (8.16) implies that

$$|h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^0\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}-\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}\bigr)(t)\Gamma\bigl(\tilde{\psi}Q_3u\bigr)\Bigr)d\tau\Bigr)| \le C\varrho^3\tilde{\gamma}^3h^{-3}\bigl(\frac{\mu h}{\varrho^2}\bigr)^s. \tag{8.18}$$

Then the same inequalities (8.17)-(8.18) hold with $\tilde{\psi}$ replaced by our target function ψ, and with $\tilde{\gamma}$ replaced by 1. Further, summation with respect to partition of unity in ξ_3 results in the inequalities with the same left-hand expressions and with right-hand expressions $C\bar{\zeta}|\log h|h^{-2}$ and $Ch^{-2}\bigl(\mu^3h\bigr)^s$ respectively because $\varrho_1'\ge C\mu^{-1}$. *Both these expressions are less than* Ch^{-2}.

8.3 Proof of Theorem 0.3(ii). Conclusion

Now we need to analyze zone $\{\varrho_1' \ge |\xi_3| \ge \varrho_1\}$ if it is non-empty i.e. $\varrho_1' \ge \varrho_1$ which is possible only in the case $(8.6)_1$. In this zone we fix $\varrho = \varrho_1'$ and $\varepsilon = \gamma = Ch|\log h|/\varrho_1$ and consider just one element Q_3.

Further, one can study propagation of singularities with respect to x_2, ξ_2, ξ_3 rather than with respect to x_3. Then the same estimates (8.12),(8.14)-(8.18) hold with $T_1 = \epsilon\zeta$ and $T_0 = Ch|\log h|/(\zeta\varepsilon)$, $\bar{T}_0 = Ch/(\zeta\varepsilon)$ which are exactly the same as in subsection 8.2 with given fixed ϱ and ε. In the end of the day we get upper bounds Ch^{-2} again.

Analysis in the zone $\{|\xi_3| \le \varrho_1\}$ has been done in subsection 8.2. Summation of all of zones including $\{|\xi_3| \ge \bar{\varrho}_1\}$ leads to the estimate

$$|\Gamma\bigl(\psi e(x,x,0)\bigr) - h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t)\Gamma\psi u\bigr)\Bigr)d\tau| \le Ch^{-2} \tag{8.19}$$

which in turn together with the standard result rescaled implies

$$|\int \psi(x)\Bigl(e(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{W}}(x,0)\Bigr)\,dx| \le Ch^{-2} \tag{8.20}$$

and one can see easily hat the approximation error does not exceed Ch^{-2} as well.
▶ Theorem 0.3(ii) is proven.

Remark 8.2. The same arguments for $\mu \ge h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ lead to the remainder estimate $O\bigl((\mu h)^{\frac{3}{2}}h^{-3}\bigr)$. This estimate is not the smoothness-related and cannot be improved without condition (0.11) even in the smooth case.

8.4 Spectral asymptotics. $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$. Estimates. I

As I mentioned, in this case we have essentially one-dimensional Schrödinger operator (or rather a family of them).

We need to refine arguments of subsections 8.2, 8.3. Due to section 7 we need to consider zone $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \{|\xi_3| \le \bar{\varrho}_1 = C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ only.

Let us introduce admissible functions $\gamma = \gamma_{(n)}$ and $\rho = \rho_{(n)}$ of (x_2, x_3, ξ_2) similar to those introduced in subsection 8.3:

$$\gamma = \epsilon \min\Bigl\{\eta, |W + (2n+1)\mu h| \le \vartheta(\eta), |\nabla W| \le \eta^{-1}\vartheta(\eta)\Bigr\}, \qquad \rho = \vartheta(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{8.21}$$

Let us consider $(\gamma;\varrho)$-admissible partition with respect to $(x_2, x_3, \xi_2; \xi_3)$ and corresponding pdos $Q'(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2)$ and $Q_3 = q_\varrho(hD_3)$. Relations between ρ and ϱ will be clarified later.

We assume that logarithmic uncertainty principle holds:

$$\varrho\gamma \geq Ch|\log h|, \qquad \gamma^2 \geq C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|; \tag{8.22}$$

this condition will be later weakened to $\varrho\gamma \geq Ch, \gamma^2 \geq C\mu^{-1}h$.

Note, that remark 8.1(i) remains valid then and therefore we can assume that $\varrho \leq C\rho$; contribution of other partition elements will be negligible.

Let us introduce in this zone (defined by (8.21) and (8.22)) mollification parameter

$$\varepsilon = C\varrho^{-1}h|\log h|. \tag{8.23}$$

In this subsection we consider elements on which

$$|W + (2n+1)\mu h| \asymp \rho^2 = \vartheta(\gamma); \tag{8.24}$$

then remark 8.1(ii) remains valid as well and we can assume that $\varrho \asymp \rho$ and we will not distinguish between these two parameters in this subsection. In particular, we need to consider only terms with numbers n'

$$|n' - n| \leq C\frac{\varrho^2}{\mu h}, \qquad \varrho \asymp \rho_{(n)}. \tag{8.25}$$

Further, due to our standard propagation arguments $\Gamma'(Q'Q_3u_n) \equiv 0$ for $|t| \in [T_0, T_1]$ with $T_0 = Ch\rho^{-2}|\log h|$ and $T_1 = \epsilon\gamma\rho^{-1}$.

Furthermore, due to standard propagation-rescaling arguments estimate (8.12) holds with $\bar{T}_0 = Ch\rho^{-2}$; here and below we use the same functions χ, $\bar{\chi}$ as before. In turn this inequality implies inequality similar to (8.15):

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_{T_1}\Gamma\bigl(Q'Q_3u_n\bigr)\Bigr)| \leq C\varrho^{-1}\gamma^3\mu h^{-1} \qquad |\tau| \leq \epsilon\varrho^2 \tag{8.26}$$

In turn inequality (8.26) yields that

$$\begin{multlined}| \operatorname{Tr}' \langle\bigl(\mathfrak{T}\psi\tilde{E}(0)\mathfrak{T}\Upsilon_n, Q'Q_3\Upsilon_n\rangle - \\ h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^0 \Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\psi_n Q'Q_3u_n\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigr)d\tau| \leq \\ C\varrho^{-1}\gamma^3\mu h^{-1} \times \varrho\gamma^{-1} = C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2\end{multlined} \tag{8.27}$$

where $\mathfrak{T}$ is the reducing operator, $\tilde{E}(\tau)$ is the spectral projector of the mollified and pulled back operator $\tilde{A}$, $\langle .,. \rangle$ is an inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^1_{x_1})$, Tr' is an operator trace for operators in

$L^2(\mathbb{R}^2_{x'})$, $\psi_n v = \langle \mathfrak{T}^{-1}\psi\mathfrak{T}(v\Upsilon_n),\Upsilon_n\rangle$ for $v=v(x_2,x_3)$ then $\psi_n=\psi_n(x_2,x_3,\mu^{-1}hD_2,\mu^{-1}hD_3)$ and we will be more explicit later.

Actually it was enough to prove (8.27) for $\varrho=\gamma=1$, $\mu\ge 1$, $h\le 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|W+(2n+1)\mu h|\le C,\quad |\nabla W|\le C,\\ &\qquad |\nabla W(z)-\nabla W(z')|\le C\bigl|\log|z-z'|\bigr|^{-1}\qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp} Q'\end{aligned}\tag{8.28}$$

and

$$|W+(2n+1)\mu h|\asymp 1 \qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp} Q'.\tag{8.29}$$

Then, assuming instead that

$$\begin{aligned}&|W+(2n+1)\mu h|\le C\varrho^2,\quad |\nabla W|\le C\rho^2/\gamma,\\ &\qquad |\nabla W(z)-\nabla W(z')|\le C\rho^2\gamma^{-1}\cdot\bigl|\log|z-z'|\bigr|^{-1}\qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp} Q'\end{aligned}\tag{8.30}$$

and

$$|W+(2n+1)\mu h|\asymp \rho^2,\qquad \text{on } \operatorname{supp} Q'\tag{8.31}$$

after rescaling $x_k\mapsto x_k/\gamma$, $h\mapsto h/(\varrho\gamma)$, $\mu\mapsto\mu\gamma/\varrho$ we get the previous case provided

$$\rho\gamma\ge Ch,\qquad \mu\ge\rho/\gamma\tag{8.32}$$

where for our choice of ρ,γ the second condition is due to the first one and $\mu\ge h^{-\frac13}$. Also one can check easily that for our choice of ρ,γ continuity condition is fulfilled after rescaling but one still need to check it in general. This analysis implies a little improvement of (8.27):

Proposition 8.3. *Estimate (8.27) holds under assumptions (8.30) – (8.32).*

We also need a trivial

Remark 8.4. Under conditions (8.30),(8.32) only (without (8.31)) both terms $|\operatorname{Tr}'\langle\bigl(\mathfrak{T}\psi\tilde{E}(0)\mathfrak{T}\Upsilon_n,Q'Q_3\Upsilon_n\rangle|$ and $|h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^0\Biggl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\psi_nQ'Q_3u_n\bigr)\Bigr)\Biggr)d\tau|$ do not exceed $C\rho\gamma^3\mu h^{-2}$. In particular (8.27) holds as $\varrho\gamma\asymp h$.

8.5 Spectral asymptotics. $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}|$. Calculations. I

Further, ne can prove easily by the same methods as in section 5 of [BrIvr] the following

Proposition 8.5. *Under assumptions (8.30) – (8.32) estimate*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(8.33)\quad & |h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} \Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma\bigl(\psi_n Q' Q_3 u_n\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau - \\
& \qquad \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\mu h^{-2}\int \theta\Bigl(-\xi_3^2 - W_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\Bigr)\omega_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\xi_3)\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2\,d\xi_3| \le \\
& \qquad\qquad C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2|\log\gamma|^{-\sigma}
\end{aligned}
$$

holds with $\omega_n = \psi_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\mu^{-1}\xi_3)Q'(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)Q_3(\xi_3)$.

From this statement and proposition 8.3 we get immediately

Corollary 8.6. *Estimate*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(8.34)\quad & |\operatorname{Tr}'\langle\bigl(\mathfrak{T}\psi\tilde E(0)\mathfrak{T}\Upsilon_n, Q'Q_3\Upsilon_n\rangle - \\
& \qquad \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\mu h^{-2}\int \theta\Bigl(-\xi_3^2 - W_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\Bigr)\omega_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\xi_3)\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2\,d\xi_3| \le \\
& \qquad\qquad C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2
\end{aligned}
$$

holds.

Remark 8.7. (i) With given $\varepsilon = Ch|\log(h/\rho\gamma)|\varrho^{-1}$ [39] approximation error in (8.33) does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2|\log\gamma|^{-\sigma}$.

(ii) Under conditions (8.30),(8.32) alone (8.34) holds for $\rho\gamma \asymp h$.

8.6 Spectral asymptotics. $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$. Intermediate zone. Estimates

In this subsection we consider *intermidiate zone*

$$
(8.35)\qquad \mathcal{Z}_1' = \{\varrho_1 = \epsilon_0(\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le |\xi_3| \le \bar\varrho_1 = C\min\bigl((\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1\bigr)\}
$$

in which $\varrho^2 \ge \varepsilon\mu h$ and we need to take into account $\asymp \varrho^2/(\mu h)$ terms in the decomposition. This will compensate possible degeneracy.

---

[39] Which is (8.23) rescaled.

We know that the contribution of $(\gamma;\varrho)$-admissible element of the partition to the remainder estimate (8.31) does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$; then

$$\begin{aligned}(8.36)\quad |\sum_n \Bigl(& \operatorname{Tr}'\langle (\mathfrak{T}\psi\tilde{E}(0)\mathfrak{T}\Upsilon_n, Q'Q_3\Upsilon_n\rangle - \\ & \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\mu h^{-2}\int \theta\Bigl(-\xi_3^2 - W_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2)\Bigr)\omega_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\xi_3)\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2\,d\xi_3\Bigr)| \le \\ & \qquad C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2\times\frac{\varrho^2}{\mu h} = Ch^{-2}\gamma^3\end{aligned}$$

because for no more than $C\varrho^2/(\mu h)$ numbers n we have $\rho_{(n)}\asymp\varrho$ and in our case we should take $\vartheta(\eta)=\eta$ and $\rho^2\asymp\gamma$ because we need to satisfy condition (8.31); then for Q' replaced by 1-admissible pdo, the left-hand expression of (8.36) does not exceed Ch^{-2}. Further, after summation over ϱ-admissible partition with $\varrho=\frac{1}{2}|\xi_3|$ we get that for Q_3 supported in $\mathscr{Z}'$ the left-hand expression of (8.36) does not exceed

$$(8.37)\quad Ch^{-2}\int_{\varrho_1}^{\bar{\varrho}_1}\varrho^{-1}\,d\varrho = Ch^{-2}\log(\bar{\varrho}_1/\varrho_1)\asymp Ch^{-2}\bar{\zeta}^{-1},$$

$$\bar{\zeta}^{-1}\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\begin{cases}\log|\log h| & \text{for } \mu\le h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1},\\ |\log(\mu h)| & \text{for } h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}\le\mu\le Ch^{-1}\end{cases}$$

which is a tiny bit larger than Ch^{-2}: it contains an extra factor $\bar{\zeta}^{-1}$ which does not exceed $C\log|\log h|$.

To get rid of this factor we need just to have $|\nabla W|\le\bar{\zeta}$. Therefore let us introduce temperate function γ by (8.21) with $\vartheta(\eta)=\eta|\log\eta|^{-2}$.

(i) Let us consider first elements with $\gamma\le|\log h|^{-\delta}$ and thus $|\nabla W|\le\bar{\zeta}$; then $\rho^2\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}C\gamma|\log\gamma|^{-2}$ $C\gamma\bar{\zeta}$. In turn, on such elements we can introduce temperate functions

$$(8.38)\qquad \ell=\ell_{(n)}=\epsilon\zeta^{-1}|W+(2n+1)\mu h|,\qquad \varrho=\varrho_{(n)}=(\ell\zeta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\le\rho^2$$

with $\zeta=\bar{\zeta}$ and we can make $(\ell;\varrho)$-admissible (sub)partition in $(x_2,x_3,\xi_2;\xi_3)$.

Then all the above arguments hold on these subelements and then for them the left-hand expression of (8.36) does not exceed $C\bar{\zeta}\ell^3h^{-2}$ where ϱ now is fixed and n are calculating accordingly. Therefore for original elements the left-hand expression of (8.36) expression does not exceed $C\bar{\zeta}\gamma^3$ and the total contribution of such elements to the remainder estimate does not exceed (8.37) multiplied by $\bar{\zeta}$ and then we conclude that *the contribution of all elements with $\gamma\le|\log h|^{-\delta}$ does not exceed Ch^{-2}.*

(ii) Now let us consider remaining elements. On each such element $|\nabla W| \asymp \zeta = |\log\gamma|^{-2} \in [\bar\zeta, 1]$. Let us introduce again temperate functions ℓ, ϱ by (8.38) and consider corresponding (sub)partition in $(x_2, x_3, \xi_2; \xi_3)$.

On every subelement we can trace propagation until time $T_1 = \epsilon\varrho$ which is larger than $T_0 = Ch\varrho^{-2}|\log h|$ as long as $\varrho \ge C(h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ which is always the case if

$$\mu \ge h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{2}{3}}. \tag{8.39}$$

But then for time $T \in [T_1, T_1^*]$, $T_1^* = \epsilon\gamma\zeta^{-1}$ the shift with respect x_3 does not exceed $C\zeta T$; further, this shift is exactly of this magnitude provided $|\nabla_\parallel W| \asymp \zeta$. Also, the shift with respect (x_2, ξ_2) does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}\zeta T$; further, this shift is exactly of this magnitude provided $|\nabla_\perp W| \asymp \zeta$.

Then logarithmic uncertainty principle holds as long as $\zeta\varrho\cdot\varepsilon \ge Ch|\log h|$ which holds for $\varepsilon = Ch|\log h|\zeta^{-1}\varrho^{-1}$ and it does not exceed γ under condition (8.39). Then the contribution of such subelement to the remainder does not exceed $C\varrho^2\ell^3\gamma^{-1}h^{-2}$ which in turn does not exceed $C\ell^3|\log\varrho|^{-2}$ because obviously $\varrho^2\gamma^{-1}| \le |\log\varrho|^{-2}$. But then the total contribution of all such elements to the remainder does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\int \varrho^{-1}|\log\varrho|^{-2}\,d\varrho \le Ch^{-2}$.

On the other hand, contribution of every such element to approximation error does not exceed $Ch^{-3}\gamma^3\varrho varepsilon|\log h|^{-2} \le Ch^{-2}\gamma^3\bar\zeta^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and their total contribution does not exceed $Ch^{-2}|\log h|^{-1}\bar\zeta^{-2}$. But this expression is less than Ch^{-2}.

(iii) If condition (8.39) is violated one can apply the same arguments (with rescaling) but small parameter will be (h/ϱ^3) and terms, which were negligible before, now just do not exceed "correct estimate" multiplied by $(h/\varrho^3)^s$. However, this estimate of former negligible terms is sufficient to recover correct estimates. I leave all details to the reader.

Finally, on each subelement the "correct Weyl expression" is

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} \Bigl(F_{t\mapsto h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t)(\Gamma' Q' Q_3 u)\bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau \tag{8.40}$$

with $T = T_0 = Ch\varrho^{-2}|\log h|$ under condition (8.39) and with $T = T_0 =$
$Ch\varrho^{-2}|\log(h/\varrho^3)|$ otherwise. One can notice easily that (8.40) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\sum_n \mu h^{-2}\int \theta\Bigl(-\xi_3^2 - W_n(x_2, x_3, \xi_2)\Bigr)\omega_n(x_2, x_3, \xi_2, \xi_3)\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2\,d\xi_3 \tag{8.41}$$

modulo $C\ell^3|\log h|^{-2}$ and then the total contribution of these last error terms does not exceed Ch^{-2}. Therefore we have proven

Proposition 8.8. *The left-hand expression of (8.36) with $Q' = I$ and Q_3 supported in the intermediate zone (e.g. $Q_3 = \bigl(\bar\chi_{\bar\varrho_1} - \bar\chi_{\varrho_1}\bigr)(hD_3)$) does not exceed Ch^{-2}.*

8.7 Spectral asymptotics. Inner zone

Now let us consider a *true inner zone*

$$\mathcal{Z}'' = \Bigl\{|\xi_3| \le \varrho_1 = \epsilon_0 \min\bigl((\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1\bigr)\Bigr\}. \tag{8.42}$$

Here we fix $\varrho = \varrho_1$ and will not refer to it as ϱ. So far we do not distinguish between cases $\mu \le C_0 h^{-1}$ and $\mu \ge C_0 h^{-1}$ but in the latter case true inner zone covers classically permited zone completely.

Let us introduce there functions $\gamma_{(n)}$ and $\rho_{(n)}$ by (8.21) but we take $\vartheta(\eta) \le \eta$ corresponding to declared smoothness which will be important now. We replace γ by $\max(\gamma, \bar\gamma_0)$ with $\bar\gamma_0$ defined by

$$\bar\gamma_0 \cdot \vartheta(\bar\gamma_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Ch \tag{8.43}$$

to keep uncertainty principle (but not necessarily logarithmic uncertainty principle).

Consider corresponding partitions of unity.

(i) If on some element $|W + (2n+1)\mu h| \asymp \rho^2_{(n)}$ then, according to corollary 8.6, contribution of each such element into remainder does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$. Further, unless $\rho \le \varrho_1$, this contribution is negligible.

(ii) Now consider elements with

$$|\nabla W| \asymp \zeta \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \rho^2\gamma^{-1} = \vartheta(\gamma)\cdot\gamma^{-1}. \tag{8.44}$$

On each such element we define ℓ, ϱ functions of $(x_2, x_3, \xi_2; \xi_3)$ and n by (8.38) with ζ defined by (8.40). We also replace ℓ by $\max(\ell, \bar\ell_0)$ where $\bar\ell_0 = Ch^{\frac{2}{3}}\zeta^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ is defined from

$$\bar\ell_0 \cdot (\zeta\bar\ell_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Ch. \tag{8.45}$$

On each subpartition element Let us consider corresponding subpartition we introduce mollifying parameter

$$\varepsilon = Ch\varrho^{-1}|\log(h/\varrho\ell)|. \tag{8.46}$$

Then for any subelement *there exists only one number n with $\varrho_{(n)} \le \varrho_1$.*

According to corrolary (8.6, contribution of each such subelement into remainder does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\ell^2$. Then taking the sum over all subelements, we derive thatthe contribution of the original element to the remainder estimate does not exceed

$$C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2 \int_{\bar\ell_0/\gamma}^{\min(\varrho_1^2/\rho^2, 1)} z^{-1}\,dz = C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2 \log\bigl(\min((\varrho_1^2/\rho^2, 1)\gamma/\bar\ell_0\bigr). \tag{8.47}$$

This is a bit short of what we want:

Proposition 8.9. *(i) Contribution of the partition element to the remainder does not exceed* $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$.

(ii) Contribution of the partition element to the difference between (*8.40*) *and* (*8.41*) *does not exceed* $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$.

(iii) Contribution of the partition element to the mollification error does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$.

Proof. Without any loss of the generality we can assume that $\rho = \gamma = 1$. Really, we can always rescale $x \mapsto x/\gamma$, $\xi_3 \mapsto \xi_3/\rho$, $\ell \mapsto \ell/\gamma$, $\varrho \mapsto \varrho/\rho$, $h \mapsto h/(\rho\gamma)$, $\mu \mapsto \mu\gamma/\rho$, $\varepsilon \mapsto \varepsilon/\gamma$, $\zeta \mapsto 1$.

(i) To estimate the contribution of each subelement to the remainder by $C\mu h^{-1}\ell^2$ we applied proposition 8.3 with $T_1 = \epsilon\varrho^{-1}\ell$. However, we can increase its value a bit to $T_1^* = \epsilon\varrho^{-1}\ell\cdot\min\bigl(|\log\ell|^{\sigma}, |\log(\ell h^{-\frac{2}{3}})|^{\sigma}\bigr)$; one can easily prove it by a long-range propagation result as in the proof of proposition (5.3).

Then contribution of each partition subelement to the remainder does not exceed

$$C\mu h^{-1}\ell^2\Bigl(|\log\ell|^{-\sigma} + |\log(\ell h^{-\frac{2}{3}})|^{-\sigma}\Bigr). \tag{8.48}$$

This is true for $\ell \ge Ch^{\frac{2}{3}}$ and for $\ell \asymp Ch^{\frac{2}{3}}$ as well because in the last case we can apply remark 8.7.

(ii) Easy calculations show that contribution of each subelement to the difference between (8.40) and (8.41) does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\ell^2|\log\ell|^{-\sigma}$.

Then summation of (8.48) with respect to subpartition brings estimate of the partition element to the remainder

$$C\mu h^{-1}\int_{h^{\frac{2}{3}}}^{\min(\varrho_1^2,1)} \ell^{-1}\Bigl(|\log\ell|^{-\sigma} + |\log(\ell h^{-\frac{2}{3}})|^{-\sigma}\Bigr)\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2 \asymp \mu h^{-1}$$

and the same estimate for the contribution of the partition element to the difference between (8.40) and (8.41).

(iii) The contribution of each subelement to mollification error does not exceed $C\mu h^{-2}\varrho^{-1}\ell^3\varepsilon|\log$ $\mu h^{-1}\ell^2|\log h|^{-1}$. Summation with respect to subpartition brings estimate of the contribution of the element to the mollification error

$$\mu h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}\int \ell^{-1}\,dx_2\,dx_3\,d\xi_2 \asymp \mu h^{-1}.$$

Returning in (i)-(iii) to the original scale we get $\mu h^{-1} \mapsto \mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$. $\square$

Since contribution of each partition element to the remainder does not exceed $C\mu h^{-1}\gamma^2$, *the whole contribution of* $\mathcal{Z}''$ *does not exceed*

$$C\mu h^{-1}\int \gamma^{-1}\, dx_2\, dx_3\, d\xi_2. \tag{8.49}$$

This general answer translates into two different estimates:

(i) Under nondegeneracy condition (0.11) we have $\gamma \asymp 1$ and the final estimate is $C\mu h^{-1}$.

(ii) In the general case the final estimate is $C\mu h^{-1}\bar{\gamma}^{-1}$ which is exactly second term in the right-hand expression of (0.27). So we had proven

Proposition 8.10. *(i) Under non-degeneracy condition contribution of inner zone* $\mathcal{Z}''$ *to the remainder estimate does not exceed* $C\mu h^{-1}$.

(ii) In the general case for $(l,\sigma)\preceq(2,0)$ *contribution of inner zone* $\mathcal{Z}''$ *to the remainder estimate does not exceed*

$$C\mu h^{-1}\bar{\gamma}_0^{-1} = C\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} \tag{8.50}$$

with $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *defined by (8.43).*

Remark 8.11. One can easily prove statement (ii) for any $(l,\sigma)\preceq(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})$. Namely, assuming that

(i) Coefficients have their m-th derivatives continuous with continuity modulus $\nu(\eta) = \vartheta(\eta)\eta^{-m}$ with $m = \lfloor(l,\sigma)\rfloor$ and that

(ii) One of these derivatives is disjoint from 0 (modified non-degeneracy condition)

we, using induction by m and arguments of section 4.4 of [Ivr1] can recover estimate $C\mu^{-1}h$.

Then, using the same arguments we can drop the modified nondegeneracy condition and prove the same remainder estimate (8.50).

8.8 Spectral asymptotics. Synthesis and clean-up

Adding all three zones - outer (empty if $\mu \ge C_0h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$), intermidiate (empty if $\mu \ge C_0h^{-1}$) and inner, we conclude that the total remainder estimate is $O(h^{-2+\mu h^{-1}})$ under non-degeneracy condition (0.11) and $O(h^{-2}+\mu h^{-1-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$ in the general case.

Now let us consider the total principal part. Note that the total contribution of $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \{|\xi_3|\le\bar{\varrho}_1\}$ to it is equal to

$$\sum_{n\ge 0}\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu h^{-1}\int \theta\Bigl(\xi_3^2 + W_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2+(2n+1)\mu h)\Bigr)\times \\ \bar{\chi}(\xi_3/\bar{\varrho}_1)\psi_n(x_2,x_3,\xi_2,\xi_3)\, dx_2\, dx_3\, d\xi_2\, d\xi_3. \tag{8.51}$$

Easy calculations show that replacing in W_n every copy of $(2n+1)\mu h$ by W brings non-essential error which does not affect the accuracy of the final answer. Also one can see easily that replacing ψ_n by $\psi\circ\phi$ we make an error lesser than $h^{-2}+\mu h$.

So, adding the contribution of the exterior zone

$$\sum_{n\ge 0}\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu h^{-1}\int \theta\Bigl(\xi_3^2+V(x)+(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)\bigl(1-\bar\chi(\xi_3/\bar\varrho_1)\bigr)\psi(x)\sqrt{g(x)}\,dx$$

we get the final asnswer

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n\ge 0}\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu h^{-1}\int \theta\Bigl(\xi_3^2+V(x)+(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)\psi(x)\sqrt{g(x)}\,dx+\\
&\sum_{n\ge 0}\frac{1}{2\pi}\mu h^{-1}\int \bar\chi(\xi_3/\bar\varrho_1)\biggl(\theta\Bigl(\xi_3^2+W(x)+(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)-\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\theta\Bigl(\xi_3^2+V(x)+(2n+1)\mu h\Bigr)\biggr)\psi(x)\sqrt{g(x)}\,dx
\end{aligned}$$

and the first term is $\int\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}\psi(x)\,dx$ while the second one is $\int\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{\mathrm{corr}}\psi(x)\,dx$.
► Theorems 0.4(ii),(iii) and 0.3 are proven.

9 Spectral asymptotics. Vanishing V or F.

We want to apply rescaling method to get rid of conditions (0.13) $V\le-\epsilon_0$ and even (0.5) $F\ge\epsilon_0$.

To get rid of condition (0.13) we introduce temperate functions $\gamma(x)=\epsilon|V(x)|$ and $\rho(x)=\gamma(x)^{\frac12}$. Then rescaling ball $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to $B(0,1)$ and dividing operator by ρ^2 we find ourselves again in our settings but with h, μ replaced by $h_{\mathrm{new}}=h/\rho\gamma$, $\mu_{\mathrm{new}}=\mu\gamma/\rho$ respectively. However we need a cut-off: in fact $\gamma(x)=\epsilon|V(x)|+\bar\gamma_0$ with an appropriate parameter $\bar\gamma_0$. Modifications in some cases are needed.

To get rid of condition (0.5) (while (0.13) holds) we introduce a temperate function $\gamma(x)=\epsilon|F(x)|+\bar\gamma_0$ with $\bar\gamma_0=\mu^{-\frac12}$.

9.1 $d=2$, vanishing V

In this case we need to satisfy condition (0.13) only for theorem 0.1(i) and in calculations of correction term for $\mu\le h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and we do not need it for sure for $\mu\ge h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$.

Consider first the case of theorem 0.1(ii) when $\bar{\mu}_1 = h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le h^{-1}$. Since we do not need condition (0.13) for $\mu_{\text{new}} h_{\text{new}} \ge 1$, we will cut off γ by picking up $\bar{\gamma}_0 = (\mu h)$. Plugging μ_{new}, γ_{new} to the remainder estimate (0.15) we see that the contribution of each element to the remainder does not exceed

$$C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\gamma + C(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log(h/\gamma^{\frac{3}{2}})|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma}h^{-2}\gamma^{3-l}$$

and the total remaainder estimate will be then due to condition (0.11)

$$C\int \mu^{-1}h\gamma^{-1}\,d\gamma + C(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}h^{-2}\int |\log(h\gamma^{-\frac{3}{2}})|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma}\gamma^{1-l}\,d\gamma.$$

The second integral is equal to the second term in the right-hand expression of (0.15) for $l < 2$; to handle the case $l = 2$ we need to notice that the second term in (0.15) is due to mollification error but in rescaled coordinates mollification parameter is $\varepsilon_{\text{new}} = (\mu_{\text{new}}^{-1}h_{\text{new}}|\log h_{\text{new}}|)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\mu^{-1}h|\log(h\gamma^{-\frac{3}{2}})|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^{-1}$ and in original coordinates it is then $(\mu^{-1}h|\log(h\gamma^{-}$
$(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and thus mollification error does not exceed the second term in (0.15) anyway.

Therefore

(9.1) Theorem 0.1(ii) without condition (0.13) remains true with the remainder estimate $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}|\log(\mu h)| + R_2$ where R_2 is the second term in the right-hand expression in (0.15).

The analysis of the case of theorem 0.1(i) is even simpler: one need to pick $\bar{\gamma}_0 = \mu^{-2}$; then on each element after rescaling either condition (0.13) is fulfilled or $\gamma \asymp \bar{\gamma}_0$ and $\mu_{\text{new}} \asymp 1$ and condition (0.13) is not needed while $h_{\text{new}} \asymp \mu^3 h \le 1$; then one can prove easily that

(9.2) Theorem 0.1(i) without condition (0.13) remains true with the remainder estimate $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}|\log(\mu h)| + R_1$ where R_1 is the second term in the right-hand expression in (0.14).

(9.3) Actually one can get rid of this logarithmic factor considering propagation of singularities which is going in direction orthogonal to ∇V with the speed $\asymp \mu^{-1}$. The actual velocity is $\frac{dx}{dt} = \mu^{-1}\sqrt{g}\cdot(F)^{-1}G\nabla V$ where $G = (g^{jk})$ and $F = (F_{jk}) = (\partial_{x_k}V_j - \partial_{x_j}V_k)$; details in the smooth case can be found in subsection 6.5.4 of [Ivr1].

(9.4) Thus we can replace $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$ by $T_1 = \epsilon\mu\min\bigl(|\log\gamma|, |\log(\gamma/\bar{\gamma}_0|\bigr)^{\alpha}$ in the Tauberian theorem provided $(1,\alpha) \preceq (l,\sigma)$.

(9.5) Also, one can calculate “the second term” and to prove that it vanishes.

(9.6) After summation we get an extra term in the remainder estimate

$$C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\int \gamma^{-1}\Bigl(|\log\gamma|^{-\sigma}+|\log(\gamma/\bar\gamma_0|^{-\sigma}\Bigr)\,dx\asymp C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}.$$

Therefore

(9.7) *Statements (i),(ii) of theorem (0.1) remain true with the same remainder estimates even without condition* (*0.13*).

9.2 $d=3$, vanishing V

For $d=3$ we need condition without condition (0.13) only for $\mu h\le 1$. Consider first Theorem 0.3 with $\mu\le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Then applying the standard scaling with $\rho=\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\bar\gamma_0=\mu^{-2}$ we will find ourselves either in the case of condition (0.13) fulfilled or in the case of $\mu_{\rm new}=1$ when it is not needed. Then contribution of each partition element to the remainder is $O\bigl(h_{\rm new}^{-2}\bigr)=O\bigl(h^{-2}\gamma^3\bigr)$ and then the total remainder is $O(h^{-2})$. Therefore

(9.8) *Theorem 0.3 holds without condition* (*0.13*). Consider now $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}\le\mu\le h^{-1}$. Then

(9.9) In non-degenerate case (under condition (0.11)) the remainder estimate was $O(h^{-2})$; plugging $h_{\rm new}$ we get the contribution of such ball to the remainder estimate does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\rho^2\gamma^2\asymp Ch^{-2}\gamma^3$ which results in the total contribution of all such balls $O(h^{-2})$. So,

(9.10) *Theorem 0.4(ii) holds without condition* (0.13).

The same arguments show that in the total contribution of all such balls $O(h^{-2})$. So,

(9.11) *Theorem 0.4(i) holds without condition* (*0.13*) *provided* $l<2$.

(9.12) In the general case we have an extra term $R_3\overset{\rm def}{=}C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$ in the remainder estimate. However, this term does not translates well: after we plug $\mu_{\rm new}$, $h_{\rm new}$ it produces $C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}|\log(h/\rho\gamma)|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}\times\gamma^{3-\frac{l-1}{2(l+2)}}$ and without condition (0.11) this greater than R_3 even if $l=1$.

However, we can introduce a different kind of scaling. Namely, introduce γ defined by

$$\gamma=\min\bigl\{\eta:|V|\le C\vartheta(\eta),|\nabla V|\le C\eta^{-1}\vartheta(\eta). \tag{9.13}$$

I remind that $(l,\sigma)\preceq(2,0)$; otherwise we can apply arguments of section 4.4 of [Ivr1] (see also Remark 8.11). In this case we can take $\rho=\gamma^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log\gamma|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ and depending on which inequality transforms into equality we find ourselves after rescaling in two different situations:

(i) If $|V|\asymp\gamma^l|\log\gamma|^{-\sigma}$ we are in the degenerate situation with $V_{\rm new}$ disjoint from 0. Plugging $h_{\rm new}$ into Ch^{-2} we get $Ch^{-2}\rho^2\gamma^2$ which does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\gamma^3$. Plugging $h_{\rm new}$, $\mu_{\rm new}$ into $C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$ we get

$$C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}|\log(\frac{h}{\rho\gamma})|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}\times\rho^{\frac{2}{l+2}}\gamma^{-\frac{l}{l+2}}\times\gamma^3\asymp$$
$$C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}\Bigl(|\log(\frac{h}{\rho\gamma})|\cdot|\log\gamma|\Bigr)^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}\times\gamma^3$$

which does not exceed $C\mu h^{\frac{l}{l+2}}h^{-2}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}\times\gamma^3$.

Summation over all these balls just eliminates factor γ^3.

(ii) If $|\nabla V|\asymp\gamma^{l-1}|\log\gamma|^{-\sigma}$ then after rescaling we find ourselves in the non-degenerate situation with $V_{\rm new}$ not necessarily disjoint from 0. However, we already examined this in (9.9)-(9.10) and found that contribution of the ball to the remainder estimate would not exceed $Ch_{\rm new}^{-2}$ which in turn does not exceed $Ch^{-2}\gamma^3$ and then the total contribution of such balls does not exceed Ch^{-2}. So,

(9.14) *Theorem 0.6 holds without condition* (0.13).

9.3 $d=2$, vanishing F

Assume that V is disjoint from 0 but F vanishes and

$$|\nabla(F^3/V)|\geq\epsilon. \tag{9.15}$$

Then we can introduce $\gamma=\epsilon|F|+\bar\gamma_0$ and rescaling $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to $B(0,1)$ we find ourselves in frames of theorem 0.1 with $\mu_{\rm new}=\mu\gamma^2$, $h_{\rm new}=h/\gamma$. Thus we need to take $\bar\gamma=\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; then for $\gamma\asymp\bar\gamma_0$ we are in "normal magnetic field" situation ($\mu_{\rm new}\asymp1$) when condition (0.5) is not needed and $h_{\rm new}=\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h\leq1$ as long as $\mu\leq h^{-2}$.

We assume that $l=2,\sigma=1$. Consider first the case $1\leq\mu\leq h^{-1}$. Then the contribution of $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to the remainder is $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\gamma^{-1}\bigr)$ and the total contribution does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\int\gamma^{-3}dx\asymp Ch^{-1}$ due to (9.15).

Consider now the case $h^{-1}\leq\mu\leq h^{-2}$. Let us assume that $V\asymp1$ (so o $n=0$ in condition (0.10)). Then contribution of $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to the principal part is $\asymp h^{-2}\gamma^2$

and to the remainder $O\bigl(\mu{-}1h^{-1}\gamma^{-1}\bigr)$ as long as $\gamma\le\bar\gamma_1=C(\mu h)^{-1}$. On the other hand, contribution of $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to the principal part is 0 and to remainder estimate is negligible. Then the total principal is $\asymp h^{-2}\bar\gamma_1\asymp\mu^{-1}h^{-3}$ and the remainder estimate is $O(h^{-1})$ again.
.

Consideration of extra terms due to the lesser smoothness is left to the reader.

9.4 $d=3$, vanishing F

We assume that g^{jk},F^k have an extra smoothness 1 in comparison which is required in theorems we refer to. This assumption allows us to avoid problems straightening magnetic field.

Consider first case $\mu\le h^{-\frac13}$. Then $\mu_{\rm new}\le h_{\rm new}^{-\frac13}$ as well and the contribution of $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to the remainder estimate is $O(h_{\rm new}^{-2})=O(h^{-2}\gamma^2)$ and the remainder estimate does not exceed

$$Ch^{-2}\int\gamma(x)^{-1}\,dx\le\left\{\begin{aligned}&Ch^{-2}\mu^{\frac12}&&\text{in the general case}\\&Ch^{-2}\log\mu&&\text{under condition }(9.17)_1\\&Ch^{-2}&&\text{under condition }(9.17)_2\end{aligned}\right.\tag{9.16}$$

with

$$|\nabla\mathbf{F}|\ge\epsilon_0,\tag*{$(9.17)_1$}$$

$$\sum_{j,k}|\Delta_{jk}(\nabla\mathbf{F})|\ge\epsilon_0\tag*{$(9.17)_1$}$$

where $\Delta_{jk}(\nabla\mathbf{F})$ denote 2×2 minors of matrix $(\nabla\mathbf{F})=(\partial_{x_j}F^k)$.

Note that $(9.17)_1$ implies that after rescaling condition (0.11) is fulfilled.

Consider now case $h^{-\frac13}\le\mu\le h^{-1}$. Under condition $(9.17)_1$ contribution of $B\bigl(x,\gamma(x)\bigr)$ to the remainder is $O(h_{\rm new}^{-2})=O(h^{-2}\gamma^2)$ and then the total remainder is $O(h^{-2}\log\mu)$ and it is $O(h^{-2})$ under condition $(9.17)_2$. Analysis in the case when $(9.17)_1$ fails is rather standard and boring.

Finally, for $h^{-1}\le\mu\le h^{-2}$ magnitude of the remainder and the principal part strongly depend on the behavior of $\operatorname{mes}\{x,F(x)\le\eta\}$ as $\eta\to+0$. In particular, in the generic case

$$|\det(\nabla\mathbf{F})|\ge\epsilon_0\tag*{$(9.17)_3$}$$

the remainder is $O(\mu^{-2}h^{-4})$ while the principal part is of magnitude $\mu^{-3}h^{-6}$.

References

[BrIvr] M. Bronstein, V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. Pushing the Limits*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 99–123.

[Dim] M. Dimassi. *Développements asymptotiques de l'oprateur de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique fort*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **26** (2001) 3&4, 595–627.

[Ivr1] V. Ivrii. *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics, Springer-Verlag*, SMM, 1998, xv+731.

[Ivr2] V. Ivrii. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. I*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **4** (1996) 1, 29–74.

[Ivr3] V. Ivrii. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. II*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **5** (1997) 3, 321–354.

[Ivr4] V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, (2000) 22, 1155–1166.

[Ivr5] V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. II. Boundary and Degenerations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 125–156.

[Ivr6] V. Ivrii. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. IV. Multidimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field. Full-rank case, (to appear).*

[Ivr7] V. Ivrii. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. V Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field, (in progress).*

[Ivr8] V. Ivrii. *Accurate spectral asymptotics for periodic operators*, Journés "Équations aux Drivés Partielles" (Saint-Jean-de-Monts, 1999), Exp. No. V, 11 pp., Univ. Nantes, Nantes, 1999.

[MeRo] M. Melgaard, G. Rozenblum *Eigenvalue asymptotics for weakly perturbed dirac and Schrödinger operators with constant magnetic fields of full rank*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 1–52.

[Rai1] G. Raikov. *Border-line eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential Integral Equations*, Operator Theory, **14** (1991) 6, 875–888.

[Rai2] G. Raikov. *Strong electric field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Lett. Math. Phys., **21** (1991) 1, 41–49.

[Rai3] G. Raikov. *Strong-electric-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the perturbed magnetic Schrödinger operator* Comm. Math. Phys., **155** (1993) 2, 415–428.

[Rai4] G. Raikov. *Semiclassical and weak-magnetic-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor., **61** (1994) 2, 163–188.

[Rai5] G. Raikov. *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator in strong constant magnetic fields* Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **23** (1998) 9–10, 1583–1619.

August 22,2003

Department of Mathematics,
University of Toronto,
100, St.George Str.,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3
Canada
ivrii@math.toronto.edu
Fax: (416)978-4107